The Churchman.

VOLUME XVII. No. 24. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii.—15. WHOLE NUMBER, 856.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1847. AT No. 12 JOHN STREET.

THE FLOWERS.

THE HELIOTROPE.

Through all the changes of the day,
I turn me to the sun;
In clear or cloudy skies I say,
Alike, *Thy will be done!*

THE VIOLET.

A lowly flower, in secret bower,
Invisible I swell;
For blessing made, without parade,
Known only by my smell.

THE LILY.

Emblem of Him, in whom no stain
The eye of Heaven could see;
In all their glory, monarchs vain
Are not arrayed like me.

THE ROSE.

With ravished heart that crimson hail,
Which in my bosom grows;
Think how the lily of the vale
Became like Sharon's rose.

THE PRIMROSE.

When Time's dark winter shall be o'er,
Its storms and tempests laid,
Like me you'll rise a fragant flower,
But not like me to fade.

THE GARDEN.

The bower of innocence and bliss
Sin caused to disappear;
Repent, and walk in faith and love,
You'll find an Eden here.

[*Bishop Horne.*

For the Churchman.

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

In vindication of the late President of Kemper College from the recent attacks of Presbyters in the Diocese of Missouri.

The New York "Churchman" of March 12th invites the particular attention of its readers to an apparently official communication in that number, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Griswold, of St. Louis, which the editor is disposed to endorse as *a thorough exposure of the affairs of Kemper College*. He was probably not aware at the time that the Rev. author was but a volunteer in this service; and that his official signature, as the "*Secretary of the Board of Trustees,*" was of course employed without the authority or knowledge of that body.

But the course of the "Churchman" in this matter must be pronounced even lenient and charitable, compared with that adopted, under the same date, by the editor of the Hartford "Calendar." It seems that some "Presbyter of the Diocese of Missouri," who found it exceedingly "*hard to restrain his outraged and indignant feelings,*" transmitted certain anonymous letters for publication in that journal; one of which, at least, was confessedly so charged with "harsh expressions," as to require, at the editor's hands, the suppression of "*most of the comments*" of its author, before it could be admitted into his columns. But while the editor took the liberty to expunge the objectionable parts of the communication, he appears to have found, at the same time, the most ample proofs of the allegations which it contains. "*It throws,*" he says, "*the chief blame of the sale and death of the College on its former President; and represents him as a troubler of that portion of the Church. "We believe,*" he adds, "*that the truth on this subject is pretty well understood at the East, and that the sympathies of Churchmen generally here have settled around Bishop Hawks and his faithful colaborers and supporters.*

Contrary to all such opinions, however, we are disposed to coincide with the view taken by the "*Banner of the Cross,*" *that an intelligent judgment cannot be found in this matter, until all the parties implicated have been heard.* Our firm conviction is, that the truth, which travels slowly, has yet but just begun to tip the Eastern horizon; and it will be strange indeed, if it does not continue now to obey the course of nature, and grow brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. The present letter is designed to be the harbinger of an event so much to be desired, and proposes simply, *by a plain parallel and contrast of facts and authorities,* to correct and explain some of the prominent statements recently spread before the public eye through the medium of religious prints. Our object is to take a rapid survey of the ground over which circumstances, on our part uninvited, have at last made it necessary for us to travel.

We are not called upon in this defence to affirm or deny any thing in relation to the course or the statements of the "Episcopal Recorder." Our aim is simply to make known the truth. The gentlemen who preside over that journal neither require nor expect any defence or vindication at our hands, in regard to the course which they have chosen to adopt, or the sentiments which they have chosen to utter. They appear to understand, as well as ourselves, that the terrible denunciations expended upon their heads, are only intended as a blind for the more deadly blows, directed all the while at the individual who stands more in the way at home. We will only observe, therefore, in passing, that the "Recorder" is by no means the aggressor in this strife. The zeal of the Recording Secretary has made him either forget or confound the order of events. The departed "Missionary of the Cross," edited while living by the Rev. Mr. Cressey of St. Louis, led the way in this public crusade against Mr. Hutchinson, more than a year and a half ago; and distinguished itself at the time, in the estimation of many honorable men here, by refusing alike the justice and courtesy, which were proffered even by the political papers, to admit into its columns an offered reply. A still more violent attack was afterwards made, in an article written by the Rev. Mr. Cressey, and published in the "Protestant Churchman." This boasted article, involving in its statements several other persons, as well as the late President of Kemper College, will ultimately meet with the fate which it deserves. The public will understand how much confidence to repose in this and similar efforts to manufacture public sentiment in the East, when they come to see that the representations of the article in question, in relation to the obliged course of Col. O'Fallen and others in the ultimate effort to save Kemper College, are entirely erroneous. We must decline to consult the convenience of Mr. Griswold, by withdrawing, at his suggestion, from the part which we have voluntarily chosen to assume in this defence. Even if we were not in some measure personally involved in the issue of this controversy, we should undoubtedly claim the liberty, in a service where all are self-commissioned, to commission ourselves. But in the present case, associated as we are with the late President of Kemper College in various ways, and eye witnesses as we have been of his course in Missouri, we are not disposed to stand silent, at Mr. Griswold's bidding, and see the fierce and reiterated attempt of himself and those who sympathize with him, to place that gentlemen in a false position before the distant Churches, and excite suspicions in relation to his leaving, which we are fully persuaded are as unmerited and groundless, as they are cruel and injurious. As far as the great body of this community is concerned, the late President stands already completely vindicated, and no notice whatever of their attacks would be considered necessary. A great disappointment has been evidently experienced by their authors here in regard to the reception given to their exertions. Their assaults have not by any means inflicted any important wound, either upon Mr. Hutchinson's influence, peace of mind, or the important enterprises with which, in common with ourselves, he stands connected. On the contrary, so much good has been brought out of the intended evil, that the only reply which we should consider expedient for these parts, would be to collect, if possible, and print for gratuitous distribution, an edition of a thousand copies of the various documents of the assailants. We write, therefore, only for the benefit of persons at a distance, who cannot be supposed to understand the state of things in the Diocese of Missouri, and, in order to comprehend and explain more fully the subject before us, we have requested the late President to lay before us such facts and documents, in reference to the history of his own administration, as he may feel at liberty to submit to our inspection.

There is much in the various publications under review which we shall neither attempt to answer or to imitate. Even the measure of our descent to glean from private conversations, and to deal in other matters of a similar character, will be strictly graduated by the pressure of the necessity under which we are laid. For this species of *guerrilla* warfare, we have neither taste, nor time, nor talent. Irrespective of all such proceedings, there is a great work yet to be done, before the Church can form any correct and adequate judgment in relation to past transactions, and the progress of development, in the Diocese of Missouri. The "Committee of Citizens," who attempted, in the last resort, to rescue Kemper College from destruction, have yet to report over their own signatures, and show where the responsibility of losing that ill-fated institution *does not rest*. The Trustees of "*this thing*" called O'Fallen University, whose motives and objects have been so unscrupulously assailed, have yet to speak for themselves in relation to the "*concern,*" and set forth the principles and the ends which they have held steadily in view from the beginning. The Congregation of St. George's Church, whose course has been held up to the world very much in the light of a factious and schismatical opposition to the Bishop, has yet to explain and vindicate its origin, position, principles and conduct. The recorded documents and well known facts necessary to place the course of the late President of Kemper College in its proper light, though suppressed by the Recording Secretary, have yet to appear. Indeed, the whole history of matters from the commencement remains yet to be written; and we shall be greatly mistaken if the discussion does not in the end cast a far brighter beam, not only upon the affairs of Kemper College from the beginning, but also upon "*that harmony and brotherly love,*" which Mr. Griswold affirms "*has until lately prevailed in the diocese of Missouri!*" We venture to predict that the late President has carefully preserved, and knows his resources well; and will calmly bide his time to employ them, when it shall be rendered necessary for his own defence, in a Christian spirit, in courteous terms, without a railing accusation, and with no angry feelings or unkind wish towards a soul that lives. However combined and menacing may be the efforts of his assailants to put him down; however long they may continue to proscribe him, yet we are assured that he will stand firmly at his post in their midst; a conservative member and minister of the "one holy *Catholic* and *Apostolic* Church," an unwavering supporter of the lawful exercise of all the rights and prerogatives of its Bishops, and a fearless defender of the due freedom of all classes of its clergy and laity.

We know how easy it is to single out a victim; to select a press and a sphere of operation distant from the place where he resides; and, by suppressing or explaining away every thing that is favorable; by stating truth out of its connection, proportion, and intention, which in effect is falsehood; by gleanings from flying reports of private conversations; by dark insinuations of ambitious aspiring after elevated places; and by numberless other devices of a similar character, to engender suspicion against him in parts where where he is not known, which neither truth nor life may ever be able entirely to wipe away. We are bound to presume that the whole responsibility of these attacks must rest upon the shoulders of the presbyters who made them, and that the Bishop of the Diocese neither suggested, reviewed, saw, or knew any thing about them. If the intention to publish such assaults upon one of his clergy, had been previously communicated to him, as the father, the friend, the adviser, the protector, the commander of all, in whose keeping clerical reputation, which is the treasure of the Church, is safe, he would have doubtless stayed the hands of his too impetuous presbyters; indicated a more proper course for the reformation of the offending clergymen; calmed the stormy elements into peace; and by this time spread around him a verdant moral landscape, over which the eye of the Church and the world would weep no more.

In relation to the pecuniary affairs of the College, during Mr. Hutchinson's presidency, we are pleased at length to receive and accept, as the *basis* of this whole matter, the recently published Report of a Committee of the Board of Trustees. In the two elder members of that Committee, we recognize two of the early and present friends of the late President; both of whom are incapable alike of an unjust statement, or an unkind insinuation, concerning himself or others. The Report of this Committee, adopted we believe unanimously by the Trustees, declares that there is "*no occasion to question the integrity or faithfulness of either of the Presidents in regard to the money matters of the Institution.*" It is by no means so surprising that Mr. Griswold should have accidentally overlooked this strong and satisfactory official testimony in his collections from the College Records, as that he should have originally given to such remarkable language, either the sanction of his vote, as a member of the Board, or the still more expressive sanction of his silence. Nothing but the example which the Recording Secretary has set, would have induced us *to go back of this Report,* even to correct an important omission of the Committee, in their debts of Kemper College, previous to Mr. Hutchinson's administration. This unintentional omission of the Committee naturally grew out of the difficulty that must have been found in ascertaining the precise amount of the preceding liabilities of the Institution. Professor Barry, who kept the College Books during the greater part of the administration of the late President, and who understands the subject of the College finances perhaps more perfectly than any one who has lifted a pen in this strife, has recently prepared and published the items of this omission of the Committee to which we refer, and clearly demonstrated, on the basis laid down by the Report itself, that *the current revenue of the College fully met the proper current expenditures.* The only way in which this result can possibly be effected is by holding the current revenue responsible for the articles of furniture, rendered necessary by the increased number of students, and charging as current expenses payments made on account of old debts. It would be quite as reasonable, for any thing that we can see, to hold it responsible for the library, the philosophical apparatus, and even for the necessary buildings to accommodate the Institution.

Mr. Griswold was again so unfortunate, when he attempted to state in the "Churchman" the amount of Mr. Hutchinson's loss in current revenue, as to *overlook* the *doubt* expressed by the Committee, from which he derived his "documentary" evidence, as to the propriety of including, in the charge against current revenue, *the expenditures made necessary by the increased number of students.* Mr. Griswold asserts, that the current expenses exceeded the current revenue nearly $4,000. The Committee reports this excess at about $3,900, and says that *this sum covers the expenditures for necessary fixtures,* "WHETHER SUCH AN OUTLAY BE PROPERLY CLASSED WITH CURRENT EXPENDITURES OR NOT." Now, give to the late President the benefit of this very reasonable doubt of the Committee, and supply the omission above stated, and the result is all that we claim. A full view of this whole subject will be hereafter given.

A great variety of testimony on all points involved in this controversy will be soon brought to view. We confine ourselves at present to a few specimens, which we are permitted, by our own request, to present from the correspondence of Bishop Kemper. We select this excellent prelate, because his evidence is admitted to be valid by the Rev. Mr. Griswold. "There is much," says the Recording Secretary, "in the *unwritten* history of Kemper College, which justice requires should be exposed, but which, since the deaths of Rev. Messrs. Minard and Peale, are probably not *fully* known except to the late President and one other individual—the latter, one to whose personal efforts the College owed its existence, and whose honored name it bears. Earnestly do I hope that our worthy Missionary Bishop will find time, amidst his arduous duties to give to the Church all facts, not matters of record, which he shall think necessary, to place this whole subject in its proper light." We have given this long extract from the article of Mr. Griswold, because we are fully prepared to concur in the sentiments and wishes which it expresses; and we are happy to learn from the recent correspondence of Bishop Kemper, that he intends to state "some important facts to the Church, when he next reports to the General Convention." He will then, if not before, explain how the debt of Kemper College arose; and, no doubt, give to the public, what is now much needed, an impartial, fearless, and intelligent view of its entire history. As far as the late President's administration is concerned, we already know his sentiments well; and might, at present, if space permitted, extensively anticipate the testimony which he will give on almost every point. But we must limit ourselves in this paper to the few specimens which we have promised, and leave their spirit and bearings to contrast for themselves with the various representations which have been recently spread before the public.

From the numerous letters written by Bishop Kemper to the late President of Kemper College, previous to his retirement therefrom, we have the liberty to select the following paragraphs. They are arranged, for convenience, under the respective years in which they were written.

1842.

"I feel the deepest solicitude in your present noble and most judicious struggle to save the College. I have told Mr. ——, that when you actually obtained possession of it, you were exceedingly puzzled to know how to feed the boys without increasing the debt, and that your course and exertions have been truly admirable and judicious. The more I reflect upon the last examination, and your general management of the boys, the more I am convinced that we have every prospect under your administration of having one of the first schools in Christendom at St. Louis. I trust that the importance of your station in relation to the future growth of the Church in the far west, will induce you to retain it, notwithstanding the difficulties, the trials, and the *opposition* you are obliged to encounter. In the opinion of the wise, the good, and the discerning, you and yours have won golden opinions, and have produced effects which must be lasting and highly salutary."

During the same year in which the extracts above given were written, the advice of Bishop Kemper was sought by Mr. Hutchinson in relation to the propriety of the acceptance of a call to the rectorship of Christ Church, St. Louis. The following is a portion of the Bishop's reply—

"The fact communicated by you fills me with the deepest anxiety. I have looked to you with daily increasing confidence as the real founder of the College. You have not only, with the divine blessing, saved it from destruction, but given it a character, which is of the highest promise. What is the welfare of that parish compared to the existence of our noble Institution? Your position I consider eminently useful even now, notwithstanding its embarrassments and trials. That you can conquer these I have no doubt. As to the idea of your quitting your station at the present time, I would as soon think of bidding farewell tomorrow to all my duties in the West," &c.

1843.

"The statements I was enabled to make relative to the government of the College, the *sacrifices* of yourself and Mrs. H., and especially the late spread of religious sentiments among the students, produced most happy and encouraging effects. If I can go into the next General Convention with a list of ten candidates for the ministry attached to the College, I shall feel that our efforts, our sacrifices, and our prayers have not been in vain. You have done so well, so admirably well, that I could wish you would devote your life to that Institution. But your very faithfulness, and the gratitude it excites in my mind, will compel me to use every effort to gratify your wishes, &c. May God bless and sustain you, and crown your noble *self-sacrificing* efforts with great success. That the choicest blessings of our Divine Head may descend upon you, and yours for your faithful and unremitted efforts to sustain the College, is the present prayer of yours most truly," &c.

1846.

"Although the destruction of Kemper College is a mystery which I cannot understand, and which has nearly broke my heart, yet I can think with pleasure upon the success of many of your plans, and upon the flourishing state of the Institution thirty months ago."

1847.

"I believed you deeply interested in the College and devoted to its welfare. Your government was admirable. At a great sacrifice of personal and family comfort, you moved from the Cottage into the College buildings, in order that the parental relation between you and the pupils might exist in full force. It did so exist to a remarkable extent, and its influence upon their behaviour, manners, health and study, was striking and gratifying. During parts of 1843 and 1844, the Institution was most promising; and, I believe, more useful to the Church than any College in the West. At a time when we knew not where to look for aid, and money was exceedingly scarce and stood at a very high rate of interest, you consented, at my request, to loan money to the College. You did so to a very considerable extent, and this, in all probability, saved the Institution."

And yet the assailants of the late President of Kemper College do not hesitate to deny that he deserved even the small credit of making *free sacrifices* for the College. The facts in relation to this point will be made hereafter more fully to appear. At present, we shall rest perfectly content to quote a few sentences from the pages of the gentlemen themselves who have made their representations to the world upon the subject, and leave the spirit and character of their remarks, to contrast with the recorded statements of Bishop Kemper.

"To those who know the facts belonging to the history of Mr. Hutchinson's connection with the Church and her institutions in the West, this allusion to his *sacrifices* is amusingly absurd. Mr. Hutchinson never lost one dollar by the College, either of his salary, or of money loaned, or of interest changed. I deny that he occupied his position at much sacrifice to himself. Mr Hutchinson is considered quite wealthy. His means, or a portion of them, are invested in the West, and his position enabled him to give his personal attention to his private interests. Were it true, that one of our wealthy clergymen had labored for the Church without a salary, it would be no *extraordinary thing,* and we see no reason why such an one should be trumpeted."

From the recent letters of Bishop Kemper, we are led to suppose, that so far as the late President of Kemper College is concerned, the principal difficulty which rests upon his mind, relates to *the time and mode of his resignation*. He evidently labors under the impression that this event not only took place when there were not sufficient reasons, but "in the midst of a session," and "without the giving of proper notice," and that the destruction of the College was the unavoidable consequence. It is due alike to all parties that this matter should be set in its proper light.

It will be here particularly observed, that the loss of Kemper College has never been charged by his assailants to the account of the late President's resignation. An accusation of this kind would have involved an admission and a compliment, which would have proved fatal alike to the representations and the objects, which these latter gentlemen appear to have concerted. Hence we find, in their several attacks, that the idea of Mr. Hutchinson's talents or reputation having much to do with the *prosperity*, or his retirement with the *downfall* of the College, is scouted and ridiculed. This they say, is "*a very pretty piece of romance about the effect of his withdrawal from the Presidency; and very amusing withal to us who were on the spot and know the circumstances. How many, let me ask, were attracted by the reputation and talents of the presiding officer? How many left because he did?*" In singular inconsistency, however, with all this, Mr. Griswold accidentally allows an apparent afterthought to escape him. "The resignation," he says, "was as sudden and unsuspected as it was at the *time*, and under the *peculiar circumstances, injurious to the College.*" It would have probably suited the convenience of Mr. Griswold and those who sympathized with him, if Mr. Hutchinson had been content to stand still, until all things were ready to move in the Board, as was threatened, "*not that he should have leave to resign, but that he should be dismissed.*"

We are fully prepared to admit that the resignation of the late President was immediately followed by the downfall of the College. But let it be remembered, that he had sufficient reasons for such a step, and gave the Board of Trustees ample notice, and every opportunity and facility to save it. The following letter from two members of the Board, contains facts which will not be called in question, and which places this matter in its true light:

"In relation to the resignation of Mr. Hutchinson, the *state of things* was such, that our only surprise was, that he did not resign before. He gave the Board a month's *notice* of his intended resignation, that they might prepare to meet the exigency, which would happen near the *close of the winter session; but no action was taken upon the matter for the entire month—no regret was expressed by the Corporation—no wish was manifested for his longer stay—no allusion from the Board was made to Mr. Hutchinson, that his retirement would be at all injurious to the College.* And when the resignation at length came, as promised, it was received in a far different way from any expression of *concern* or *regret*—there was then no *wish* intimated for another day's continuance at the College by the majority. Such were some of the facts, known to all the Board, which must have satisfied Mr. Hutchinson that he did not mistake the *spirit* and *wishes* of the ruling majority of the Trustees, nor resign too soon for his own self-respect."
(Signed)

EDWARD TRACY,
B. H. RANDOLPH.

St. Louis, May 26, 1847.

The most ample materials to illustrate this subject in every conceivable point of view are at command. But we are content to pause for the present, and pass on to other matters.

An exceedingly delicate task is forced upon us in this defence, by what appears to us to be the injudicious effort of Mr. Griswold to bring the Bishop and one of his Presbyters into collision upon a point of veracity. He must have known what powerful advantages the one party would possess over the other on a question of this sort, unless a kind providence should interfere to shield and protect the weak. The issue involved nothing less than *disobedience to the instructions of the Bishop and falsity of statement in a letter to the Trustees* in relation to certain funds committed to the late President for the benefit of Kemper College.

It is worthy of particular attention that *this money was faithfully expended to pay a College debt; and that the Board of Trustees approved of the manner in which it was appropriated.* Why then was the alleged "statement" of the Bishop so carefully recorded by Mr. Griswold, if some premeditated purpose was not ultimately to be answered by such an unprecedented record? Was there here no indication to suggest to the late President the propriety of resignation? What are we to think of the motives and intentions of the hand, which could deliberately spread upon the minutes of the Board, and at length publish to the world, such an unusual paper as purports to contain the very words of the Bishop. We are bound to presume that this record must be in some respects undesignedly erroneous. The whole effort is so conducted, that we are constrained to suppose, that the generous desire to do good service in the cause of the Church, invitingly betrayed the somewhat youthful and inexperienced champion into the use of terms which the Bishop did not design to employ, much less to *record*. Under all the circumstances of the case, it would certainly be a very strange thing, if this were actually the fact. As great mistakes as this have doubtless occurred before, without involving any necessary moral obliquity; and since the fact is, that the funds alluded to, *were not "placed in the hands of Mr. Hutchinson,"* as is asserted, "*in the presence of Mr. Tracy,*" but in a *private room*, with *closed door*, where no person was present but the giver and the receiver; and since, of course, "no instructions in the presence of Mr. Tracy," accompanied the act, we are compelled to believe that the zeal of the Recording Secretary has unconsciously led him into a mistake. But this matter rests not upon our assertion. It will be best understood by the statement of the respective parties, in regular order.

We begin with Bishop Hawks's statement, made to the Board, Feb. 24th, 1845, as recorded and published by Mr. Griswold—

"I gave this money to Mr. Hutchinson in the presence of Mr. Tracy, reminding him of the resolution of the Board, requesting its appropriation to the payment of dues for erecting the third story."

Next comes the statement of Mr. Tracy, in a letter addressed to the late President, March 30, 1847—

"I was at your house on the day Bishop Hawks came out there. So far as I can recollect, a few minutes after the Bishop came into the room, he remarked that the object of his visit was to place in the hands of yourself some funds he had received, to be applied towards *liquidating debts of the College.* I do not recollect that he said it was to be applied to any *specific debt.* In a short time the Bishop and yourself retired into an adjoining room; you were absent but a few minutes; what conversation passed between you in your absence, of course, I could not know. I do not think any thing more was said on the subject after your return into the room. There were several other gentlemen in the room when the Bishop came in. They may have a better recollection of the conversation than I have. Among those I now recollect were Mr. James Russell, &c." "I was present at the Board of Trustees, when your note was laid before them. I do not recollect what action, if any, was taken upon it, but I presume the Board sanctioned the manner in which you appropriated the funds, otherwise they would have directed the money placed back in the College Treasury, to be applied to some other debt."

We have seen Mr. Russell, to whom Mr. Tracy's letter refers, and he fully corroborates the statement above given in relation to the funds, and adds, that his recollection is clear as to the fact that "*no funds or specific instructions were given to Mr. Hutchinson* in his presence."

Next comes the circumstantial evidence, contained in a letter from Professor Barry, who had charge of the College Books, dated and addressed as before, April 2d, 1847.

"I recollect distinctly that shortly after Bp. Hawks left your residence, you entered my apartment in Kemper College, with a draft on Louisville in your hand, requesting me to pass the amount to the credit of the College, on the books. You likewise stated, that on inquiring of the Bishop if any particular destination was to be given to the draft, the answer was, that it was to be applied to any of the most pressing debts of the College, of which you were the best judge. It was then thought advisable to apply it to the oldest claim, which was the bill of a carpenter for work done on the west wing."

Finally comes the letter which Mr. Hutchinson wrote to the Board, as soon as he heard that he was *privately* accused of the misapplication of funds, which will speak for itself—

"Circumstances have led me to fear that my last appropriation of monies received for the benefit of the College, *though passed by the Board,* is not placed in such an attitude of entire satisfaction to *all*, as to preclude it from being used to my possible disadvantage. If my apprehension is well founded, allow me respectfully to request a review of this matter. *When I received these funds, my inquiries sought in vain after special instructions as to their application;* and supposing myself honestly free to use my best discretion, I considered the just claim of a carpenter, who labored on the College more than eighteen months ago, as entitled to preference over debts of later date. But if the Board, or *any portion* thereof, think that I was mistaken, it will give me pleasure to correct such error by placing the amount in the College Treasury for reappropriation, having only to regret that the funds in question were passed through my hands."

Many things yet remain to be made known to the public before the present issue can be properly submitted for its final decision. It will be ultimately found, for example, that the late President *never loaned a solitary dollar of his own money to Kemper College at a higher rate of interest than six per cent.;* and that he even removed the funds, furnished the Institution at this rate, from a secure investment, where they were at the time producing him the legal interest of *ten per cent.*, for no conceivable reason but to save the College in troublous times. In this way, Mr. Hutchinson made a fair donation in money to the College of *four per cent.* on the sum loaned, which amounted in the end to about $400. All the other funds supplied the Institution, were sent to Mr. Hutchinson by their proprietor in the East, with instructions, which left him no discretion to invest them at the legal interest of *ten per cent.*

It will be ultimately found, that the College was so far from exhibiting the *symptoms of decline* which have been ascribed to it, that it actually contained a larger number of students, at the time of the late President's resignation, than had ever before appeared within its walls at the same period of the session.

It will be ultimately found, that when at last the College was about to be sold for a *debt contracted long before the late President's administration*, he was so far from pressing his own claims, that he voluntarily proposed to the Trustees any indulgence they required to save the College. He afforded them every facility and aid in his power for this work, by a written proposition to place not only his own funds, but those of his friend also, at the reduced rate of *six per cent.* interest—thus subjecting himself to pay the *four per cent.* difference of interest out of his own resources for two years, if necessary, to enable the Trustees to affect the desired object, and which would have been a contribution for that end of about $400. And finally, when the premises were yielded up to the County Court, for purposes too well known, the Board of Trustees were indebted to the late President for the rescue of the library and furniture, and whatever else was sacred, from the general ruin.

It will be ultimately found, that the small amount of interest, so prominently displayed by Mr. Griswold, as having been charged by the late President on his long unpaid salary of 1843, was but an inconsiderable sum, compared with what he actually paid on monies, *borrowed at a higher rate of interest, to meet his personal expenses at the time,* because the current revenue, after other officers were paid, would not then bear the abstraction of what was due him. For what end was this very small amount of interest, which all admit to have been justly due, so ostentatiously dragged before the public bar? Why was it not stated, in connection with this, that Mr. Hutchinson was generally in advance of the collected revenues of the College; sometimes for a considerable amount and for months together; freely applying any private resources at his command to sustain the credit of the Institution; and yet never demanding or expecting a dollar of interest on funds, which he might otherwise have loaned and won equal thanks.

It will be ultimately found, that, by the performance of duties in the domestic department of the College, in no way connected with his office, and of such an arduous and disagreeable character, that no money could have purchased them at the hands of his family, Mr. Hutchinson retained in the College Treasury, for a long time, the *salary of a steward and matron;* and thus saved to the Institution the sum of at least $1500 during his administration. It was in this way that the current revenue was made to pay the current expenses.

In addition to this, it will be ultimately found, that the late President regularly presented, as an offering for the benefit of the College, the entire portion of the missionary stipend awarded him for extra services, amounting in all to about $225; and that he did not even avail himself of the usual privilege of educating his own sons without cost, but paid into the College treasury the sum of $415 for their tuition. And we ourselves are able to bear a distinct testimony, that to our certain knowledge, Mr. Hutchinson has labored in our midst for nearly two years and a half past "without receiving a dollar of salary from any source."

We are fully aware that this is directly denied, and deliberately denounced as "poetical language," and a "bare untruth!" "There is no one," says Mr. Griswold, "who has for several years stood in his place, without receiving a dollar of salary from any source," and "all allusion to his sacrifices," says another, is "amusingly absurd."

It will be borne in mind, that the late President has not provoked or invited this unhappy controversy. On the contrary, he has desired peace and only asked to be let alone. This community will attest that, under manifold provocations, both private and public in their character, he has submitted in silence to the various inflictions of his enemies. His forbearance is the witness of the sincerity with which he has endeavored to avoid this unfortunate collision. Under such circumstances he is not in any way responsible for results.

We have been compelled, against all the inclinations of the late President and ourselves, to make these brief references to a few of the facts connected with the affairs of Kemper College. When the entire body of evidence on this subject shall have been exhibited, we shall cheerfully submit the case to the public for its final decision. Time, truth, and the just sense of a discerning community, will at last indite the verdict, and write the history.

JOHN O'FALLEN,
H. S. GEYER,
WM. WILBURN,
JAMES RUSSELL,
THOMAS SHORE,
LAWRASON RIGGS,
JOSEPH F. FRANKLIN,
JOSIAH DENT,
D. H. ARMSTRONG.

For the Churchman

DISTINCTION, WITH A DIFFFRENCE.

Mr. Editor.—In your admirable editorial of July 31, you quote the new Canon of 1844, for the offences for which a Bishop may be impeached. Has it occurred to you to compare it with the corresponding Canon of 1832, relating to presbyters and deacons? Allow me to save you the trouble.

The Canon of 1832 (37), applicable to *all* ministers, enacts thus—"*Every* minister shall be liable to presentment and trial, for any crime or *gross* immorality, for disorderly conduct, for *drunkenness*, for profane swearing," &c. Please observe, that the "immorality" must be "gross," not doubtful or constructive, not an act concerning which there may be an honest difference of opinion among reputable people. For example: to buy a ticket in a lottery is held immoral by many, because lotteries have an immoral tendency; but a "gross immorality" it cannot be pronounced; again, to take a glass of wine, or brandy and water, or punch, is reprobated as immoral by the Temperance Society; but that Neptune (the new wandering star!) is not yet strong enough to *make* it a "gross immorality:" and again to go money-gathering (repeatedly) for building a church or college, or to pay their debts, and bring home (repeatedly) enough only to meet the travelling expenses and the wages of the gatherer, is akin to immorality, and *is* an immorality bordering on false pretences in a sagacious veteran in that employment; but, despicable as is the trade, it is not "grossly immoral," inasmuch as the trader *may* be sanguine to the last; nor is it dangerous, where people are fond of being *stimulated* to liberality. Other illustrations (over-free borrowing, over-free romping, dancing, public dinners, Sunday dinners, naked statuary and paintings, &c.) may be found. Please remark, also, that in this Canon, of 1832, "drunkenness" is specified, and separately specified; specified, that the thing done be not confounded with what is enjoined in scripture for "the stomach's sake and the often infirmities," or with enjoying the divinely granted indulgence of "making glad the heart of man;" separately specified, to take it out of the vague catagory of "immoralities," and even the stringent but not infallible one of "gross immoralities." All parties, suspected or suspecting, know their canonical rights or liabilities.

Such was the canon till 1841 and 1844, applicable to "every minister," a *Bishop* as well as a presbyter or a deacon. For the whole class of acts *called* immoral, yet merely doubtful, or perhaps innocent, they were left to God and their own consciences; the Church taking cognisance of those only which were "grossly" of that character. And in the other matter, their bible liberty was guarded; they might drink but not be "drunken," just as they may "be angry," but must "not sin."

What, however, is our present statute law?—Behold it! A presbyter or a deacon is under the same restriction as before; for *them* the old canon remains in force. But for a *Bishop*, the new edict proclaims—"presentment may be made for *any* crime or *immorality*, for heresy, for violation of the Constitution" &c.: not a word of "*gross* immorality," not a word of "*drunkenness;*" all is left to the phrase "any crime or [*any*] immorality;" a phrase including, by one or another construction, culpable imprudence, an indiscretion, a peccadillo, harmless or unwary familiarity, rude or thoughtless fun, many things that are "pure to the pure," right to the upright. For *such* acts, the character-destroying measure of a "presentment" *may* be resorted to, aye, and conviction had, as the omnipotent prevailing opinion of the day, or the almost omnipotent violation of an excited diocesan convention, or of "any three Bishops," or of any Episcopal Court, shall determine. This is the new Canon, for

Bishops only.—Is not this '*distinction* WITH *a difference?*'

And mark the enormity of the 'distinction' and the 'difference.' Had your Bishop been a presbyter, he could only have been presented under the old Canon,—only for "gross immorality," actual "drunkenness." He *was* presented for dubious "immorality," at the worst, and for being "under the influence of, and improperly excited by, vinous or spirituous liquors!" How, in the name of all that is just, has the Church been misled into a discrimination so abominable? And what can have induced one of her highest judicatories to administer and enforce the hideously unequal law, with no regard to the compensating remedy (imperfect though it be) in their power, a merciful judgment and lenient execution?

But this is not all. Your Bishop was impeached and tried for offences (so called) committed while he was yet under the Canon of 1832,—all but the last two of the array: and the latter came under the Canon of 1841, which was, however, repealed in 1844, before the presentment was made. Not one of the whole catalogue imputed was as late as the date of the present Canon, the only one applicable to him at the time the prosecution commenced. The new Canon makes no provision for continuing the liability for transgressions of the old one; nor was the old one transgressed, for there was no "drunkenness," and to say that the other acts amounted to "gross immorality" confounds both verbal and moral definitions. In plain English, your Bishop was presented and tried for actions which were not forbidden by the Church when they occurred.—Not only was the *mode* of trial *ex post facto*, which lawyers declare to be unlawful, but the very *indictment* rested on nothing whatever but an *ex post facto* ordinance, which is doubly fatal. He could not have been reached without the *ex post facto* machinery.—All this, conceding that the acts alleged were done, and were somewhat immoral; which concession, however, is merely for the better construction of my argument.

Some of your readers may be surprised, that, for all our ministers once, and for presbyters and deacons now, the prohibition of the Canon reaches only "gross" misdoings. Their surprise will be increased, when they are reminded of the far more lenient enactment of the Church concerning the Laity. Our Laity are subject to no discipline but repulsion from the Holy Communion, and that can be inflicted on them only according to the Rubric. Turning to the Rubric, the first ground of repulsion is, being "an open and notorious evil liver;" not only must the "life" (habits) be "evil," but "openly" so, and "notoriously" so: an effectual preclusion of ecclesiastical jeopardy from backbiting, from pique or prejudice, and from a hasty fault, as also from the crying out against "the mote in a brother's eye." The second ground of repulsion is, "doing wrong to one's neighbors by word or deed;" the offence must be a "wrong," absolutely, not hypothetically or constructively, a real injury, a wilful injury: petty antagonisms, and ordinary, social, or business jostling, and the like, are here of no account. The third ground is, the "reigning" of "malice and hatred" between two parties, both being communicants, or wishing to become such; a highly stringent protection. Of any thing short of "malice and hatred," and that "reigning," the Church takes no judicial cognisance; neither does she interpose (judicially) with communicants in behalf of non-communicants. Here is the whole rubrical liability of lay brethren of the altar; and comparing their curb with that put on our Bishops, here is 'greater distinction with a *much* greater difference.'

It is plain then, from the Canon of 1832 and from this Rubric, that the Church does not profess to administer the *entire* moral law; this Rubric and Canon are her calm legislation; and they prove that she claims to administer no more of that law than is essential to the good order of her people and her affairs. She involves not herself in Montanism or other perfection*ism*, or in any *ultra* pretensions. And in this she is right. For, the Almighty, though He gave His full law, every "jot and tittle," to be *obeyed*, hath not committed its broad *enforcement* to human pastors and governors. To discharge such a function, men must be more than men. The Church is ordered to promulge, to explain, to inculcate every commandment of God, without exception or reservation; but she is not empowered to compel judicially their observance in all their scope and comprehensiveness. Conscience, for each individual, is the wider magistrate, in this world; and so is sound and well-settled public opinion. And the judgment day will make the divine sovereignty complete, before the universe, and for eternity.

That the General Convention has gone beyond this due limit, in bringing before an ecclesiastical judicatory "ANY *immorality*," i. e. ANY violation of God's complete moral law, on the part of a class of persons within its jurisdiction, is deeply humiliating to our Church, and to all her members, who are too "meek and lowly in heart" to "stretch themselves beyond their measure," and who would not that she should "sit as God in the temple of God." LIBRA.

August 4, 1847.

For the Churchman.

THREE VIEWS OF THE QUESTION—

OUGHT BISHOP ONDERDONK TO BE RESTORED?

My first view is an extreme one, all that his worst enemies can claim. Admit him to have been guilty, of the acts imputed to him in the Presentment, and how stands the true state of the case? He has been severely punished for acts of folly and imprudence; folly and imprudence being the most unfavorable construction that can be put upon the charges, no crime having been proved that would have been indictable, either by the common or the statute law. Now can Christian men, men having one particle of the spirit of humanity, take the ground that his punishment has not been sufficient to answer the demands of justice? That it has not yet been equal to the measure of his guilt, and ought therefore, to be extended? Can they deem it right to add to its severity by placing a seal to his degradation? There is no rule in the entire criminal code more clear, than that the penalty ought to be no heavier than in proportion to the extent and degree of the crime. Has this rule been applied in the Bishop's case? Most persons, I think, must agree, that his punishment already has far exceeded the measure of his guilt, even upon the admitted truth of the charges in the Presentment. On this ground, therefore, if upon no other, *justice*, to say nothing of humanity, requires his restoration.

My second view has reference to the evidence.

It is a rule in law, "that where the defendant pleads the general issue, the prosecutor must prove every fact and circumstance stated in the indictment which is material and necessary to constitute the offence."

Was this done in the trial of Bishop Onderdonk? Compare the first article of the Presentment with the statement of the chief witness, the pious and poetical Mrs. Butler, and any candid mind will be convinced to the contrary. Again: if any doubts arise as to the full proof of guilt, the person accused is entitled to the benefit of the doubts. No individual should be condemned without the clearest evidence of an evil intention. That there have been from the beginning, and still are, doubts as to the Bishop's guilt in point of premeditated design, no one of a sane mind can deny. These doubts have been expressed by many who are free from prejudice, disinterested, and unacquainted with the parties concerned; and, an impartial examination of the whole testimony, has failed to remove them. Now as the Bishop has already been made to suffer the penalty adequate to the guilt of the charges in the Presentment, what more can his prosecutors even desire? And then, allowing him the benefit of the doubts in the case, which is no more than his legal right, would it not be in direct violation of law, equity, and the spirit of humanity, to prolong his punishment? On this ground, therefore, we have a twofold reason why he should be restored.

My third view has reference to the Court. It was divided—a strong minority was in favor of acquittal. Then we have the strongest presumptive evidence that some of the members of the majority were under the influence of personal feeling and party bias. If such a state of things could be made to appear in the case of a criminal sentenced to the Penitentiary, it would most surely effect his pardon. What, then, should prevent its operation in behalf of a Christian Bishop, who, it is honestly believed by many, has been made the victim of malevolence, envy, and detraction! NORTH.

For the Churchman.

REVIEW OF THE TRIAL OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

NUMBER TWO.

In noticing the character of the Trial of Bishop Onderdonk, some preliminary questions seem naturally to present themselves, in regard to the *kind* and *degree* of proof requisite to justify a conviction in such a case. But these are matters which excite little interest in most minds, and upon which I do not care to dwell very much. It is, in some sense, merely technical, and of a character, which, in modern times, is generally got along with, if that is the only obstacle to a conviction. Perhaps it ought to be so. I do not much wonder, therefore, that the Triers of the Bishop, if they were predetermined to convict him, should have easily disposed of the injunction of St. Paul to Timothy, (1st Epistle to Timothy, ch. 5, v. 19.) "Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before *two* or *three witnesses.*" Indeed I am willing to concede, that I think any Court, secular as well as ecclesiastical, would be sorry to have a *confessed guilty man* escape, for want of an additional witness, when the forthcoming proof was already sufficient to remove all reasonable doubt from the mind of the Triers. But if the proof actually in the case made out but a lame and doubtful case against the respondent, one attended with many suspicions, and which had long slumbered, by the acquiescence of all the parties *now* claiming to have been aggrieved, in a most *unreasonable manner*, and to a *degree*, quite compromitting their characters for piety and uprightness, under such silent endurance; in such a case so point blank a requisition of the Canon of the Holy Scripture, (which the champions of orthodoxy in Protestantism declaim so much about, as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice,) one would have thought, would have been allowed its *full weight*. The mode in which some members of the Court labored this point, upon both sides, shows very clearly, that it was regarded as a point of some difficulty upon all hands. It seems to me too, that there should be better modes of answering the objection, than by supposing that the Apostle only required that *two* or *three* witnesses should be *present* when the *accusation* was *handed in* before the judges, and so the three Bishops, presenting the accusation to the Presiding Bishop is a fair compliance with the requisition; but that there was no necessity, that the charges, either when *received*, or entertained, should be *supported* by the proof of more than one witness. I suppose that every one, the least conversant with the rules of evidence in the Jewish law, (Deut. 19 ch. 15 v.) or in the Roman civil law, *unius responsio testis omnino non audiatur, Cod* 4. 20, 9., or the Canon law of Modern Europe, *knows* that such is not the practice and never was, under either of these Codes. And the original Greek εητος ε ιμη επ ιδυσ, will more properly read "except upon the testimony of two &c." Still St. Paul *might* have been misunderstood by his contemporaries, and all subsequent generations until the present day, and he really might have intended to lay down a *new* rule upon this subject, and if so, I do not say he was not fully competent to do so; and if he did do it, by the very voice of inspiration, it seems to me, the other part of the argument of the Court, upon this point, when they admit it might have been *intended by St. Paul* to require *two* witnesses, at the worst, both in receiving the accusation and in the final hearing, before any *conviction* could follow; but that still, this rule was only *local* and *temporary*, and has no application *to this age, and to this country*; it seems to me, I say, that such a concession is yielding a great deal to the Neologists of these days, all they ask, or require, in order to justify their ten thousand new schemes, and new doctrines. But if either of these views is satisfactory to the majority of the Court, who convicted Bishop Onderdonk, one would hardly feel justified in disturbing such a self-complacency, however much he may wonder at the admirable facility of their self-delusion.

But there are one or two ideas upon this part of the law which seem to me not to have had their due weight in the minds of any of the Court. 1 I will name the consideration, that Bishop Onderdonk was really upon his *defence*, the *burden* of the proof then rested upon his *accusers*. He was quietly in *possession* of his office, with all its privileges and immunities; it was therefore incumbent upon those who would *deprive* him of these, to make out *their case*, and by *full proof*, such proof as admitted of no doubt, no *reasonable, rational* doubt. They wished to convict the accused of *a crime*, or an act which *reached a forfeiture*, and was followed by a *penalty*. This can never be done, upon any *mere suspicion*, or indeed upon merely *probable proof*; it must be such proof as excludes *all reasonable doubt of guilt*. This is a universal rule of evidence in all the secular tribunals, so that the meanest citizen will not, cannot, be deprived of the most insignificant privileges, or emolument, or even of the smallest sum of money, by way of *penalty*, upon any doubtful state of proof. And in those *important matters*, which *seriously affect character*, liberty, and life, the most *undoubted proof* is uniformly required. It is true, that jurors will convict, in some cases, upon much less evidence than others. In those States where the crime of adultery is cognizable, by the secular tribunals, juries are *suspicious*, and often convict upon *very unsatisfactory evidence*. That was so, no doubt, in the Court of Bishops. The public are always willing to believe any one guilty of such an offence, and especially a Bishop. And one cannot forbear to believe, that the public feeling must have had great weight in the conviction of Bishop Onderdonk, when the Trial was published *by order of the Court*, with a copy right secured, for the mere purpose of vindicating the Court, or else of aspersing the character of Bishop Onderdonk, through the aid of that vile suspicion which always exists, in impure minds, that all persons will be guilty of lewdness, and licentious indulgence, whenever they have opportunity; and that by consequence, all Bishops and other ministers are guilty very often, because they must have frequent opportunities. Therefore this vile compound of virulence and debauchery was sent forth to pamper the degraded appetites of a debauched and debased popular taste, *because*, forsooth, the *judges*, who tried an aged Christian Bishop, and suspended him from his office *indefinitely*, were fearful! of what? Either that *they* would be thought to have proceeded upon *mere suspicion or prejudice*; or else (which I am unwilling to believe) that they wished, through a vitiated public taste, to fix a fatal *suspicion* upon Bishop Onderdonk, and thus forever foreclose all hope of his final restoration to the functions of his office.

The Trial of the Bishop seems to have been viewed, by the majority of the Court, at least, as an inquiry, whether the proof was sufficient to excite any *suspicion* whatever of the perfect purity and propriety of the conduct of the man, at all times, and under all circumstances. Were there any concerned, in that Trial, who expect to be able to escape reproach, when tried by that standard? Was there no member of that Court who had done ought worthy of censure, since his consecration to the holy office he then filled? Had no hasty burst of anger escaped him, no rash improvidence involving himself and others in *distress* and *ruin*, no weakness, no levity, no rashness, which might bring in doubt the purity of his purposes, or the wisdom of his acts? Nothing which might require forbearance here, and forgivness hereafter? If not, then well might they justify such a self-exalting argument as was addressed to them by the Counsel for the Presentment, that all doubtful commanders, in the army of Christ, should be forthwith deposed, and upon mere *suspicion* too, and with more propriety might, perhaps, a tribunal, conscious of being themselves perfectly *immaculate*, dare to act upon such a suggestion. But to those who are conscious of much of lingering and indwelling infirmity, and sin, to visit such consequences upon others, upon mere suspicion, is not to be endured. But men *will* endure it long perhaps. It may *look well* for a time, but a day of retribution is coming, which, even here, will redress such severity. It seems to have been considered by the majority of the Court, a mere question of *policy*, whether Bishop O. should retain his office; and that his *personal* convenience must yield to the paramount interests of the Church. In short, if he had been so unfortunate as to excite the *indignation* of some, and the honest but weak minded *suspicions* of others, he must be deposed, lest it might bring disorder or scandal, upon those of us, who still retain our places, and to day are so fortunate as to be more popular than the accused. Upon the most favorable view, I do not think the proceedings of the majority of the Court can be plausibly vindicated, upon any ground, short of the *mere question of expediency*, which might justify the honor of clerical and lay delegates in the General Convention, in refusing to sign the testimonials of a Bishop Elect. In truth it would be more charitable to the Court, and more to their credit, to suppose they were led astray, by some such considerations, than any other which has occurred to me. And I certainly desire to treat their proceedings with all proper regard and courtesy. I make no doubt they were all sincere men, honest-hearted men, and who voted upon some principle which was satisfactory to themselves, and so indeed do almost all Courts and Judges, but they make some very unwise, and not a few very unjust decisions. And when they appeal to the public, for their vindication, I take it for granted, that the grounds of their judgments are open to all just and fair criticism, and I hope to keep within these limits.

2. Another oversight, it seems to me, the Triers of Bishop Onderdonk were guilty of, if they intended to try him, in *analogy* to proceedings in the secular Courts; i. e. that he was upon trial for a *violation of his consecration vows*, which was virtual perjury. It could hardly be esteemed less than the violation of a simple *oath*, at least I think no sound Churchman will esteem it so. There should then, at the least, have been the testimony of two witnesses, or what was equivalent, else no conviction could be had.

3. If it is viewed as an impeachment for official corruption, or as treason, the one case being a violation of one's official oath, and the other of the oath of allegiance, two witnesses are almost universally required, or that which is equivalent. So that whatever view we take of the requisite degree of proof, it was, even upon the claim of the majority as to its conclusiveness and weight, *technically deficient* in *amount* and *extent*. But I do not all insist upon this view of the case as I shall proceed to show, that the proof was in some respects either *simulated* or *suborned*; and in others, the result of misconception and misconstruction, and therefore entitled to no credence whatever; that Bishop Onderdonk is still to be regarded as an *innocent man*.

July, 1847. R. F. I.

For the Churchman.

Rev. Mr. Editor,—The Protestant Churchman has now seriously taken in hand the task of demolishing the "flimsy fabric" you have constructed. I had imagined that as you were demolishing the "flimsy fabric" of the presentment, trial and sentence, it was the business of the editorial *corps* of that hebdomadal to refute your arguments, and justify the proceedings of "the Court." Instead of this they cry out that you are impeaching the integrity, honor, holiness, &c., &c., of FOURTEEN BISHOPS, and contend that the appeal must not be thought of for a moment, as it would "shake the character of the Court," and be like "completing the lines of circumvallation about a beleaguered city." It is indeed difficult to answer arguments like these, if for courtesy's sake we are to call them arguments—

"Some things we know are hard for flesh and blood,
But nonsense never can be undestood."

They admit, however, that if "Bishop Onderdonk's appeal" had been "urged on the ground of newly-discovered testimony, error of judgment as to facts, mistake as to law, illegality in the mode of procedure, want of power to act under the canon, the invalidity of the sentence, &c., the real question of the guilt or innocence of the Bishop, and the legal points which have been raised in that connexion, might have been presented to the General Convention." Now these are some of the very grounds, on which you have been descanting in your editorials. You have brought forward Mr. Peck's affidavit, and that is "newly-discovered evidence;" you have shown the worthlessness of some of the testimony, (and are going on I trust in the good work,) and thus have proved that the Judges erred as to facts in relying upon that testimony; you have demonstrated the most serious defects in the presentment; prejudice and bias on the part of some of the members of the Court; the *ex post facto* character of the canon, and the irregularity and illegality of the sentence. All this then by their own admission is good ground of appeal; but the appeal is not to be admitted because you have spoken with severity of some of the Judges, of the Presenters, and of the proceedings! Bishop Onderdonk or the Diocese may come before the General Convention with the record in their hands and point to the many errors and inconsistencies, the erroneous decisions and the violations of legal rules which are to be found on its pages; and there are to be met with the reply, "Get you gone," the Editor of the Churchman says it has been "party proscription," and that "some of the Bishops closed their ears to the voice of truth in refusing to hear the opinions of the minority, and we shall punish you for his misdoings."

Another proof of conscious weakness, (i. e. as far as law and reason are concerned,) is the ridiculous *ad captandum* assertion so gravely employed, that the presumption in favor of the Court is to be settled by the Rule of Three. "There can be no doubt that a great presumption exists in favor of the purity and integrity of a Bishop: but then is it to be forgotten that a presumption of that nature in favor of the honesty of fourteen Bishops exists in a degree far greater than the proportion of 14 to 1." Let us see how this will work in a civil case. A prisoner of good previous character is accused of theft. Of course the presumption is strongly in favor of his innocence, and holds good till the contrary is proved. He is however found guilty and sentence is passed, say four judges being on the bench. His counsel discover some serious defect in the record of conviction and carry it up to a higher tribunal. When argument is had, the counsel for the people gravely argues that the judges are very *honest* men, and that therefore the presumption in favor of the validity of the trial and sentence is as *four to one*, and consequently, that the appeal should be dismissed. That this would be abundantly ridiculous is probably evident to most persons, but we suppose the proceedings of an Ecclesiastical Court are too sacred for the application of the rules of law or the maxims of common sense. If Bishop Onderdonk is to be presumed innocent of the offences alleged till his guilt is proved, in accordance with the rules of law, and the presumption is the stronger because of his standing and long ministration in the Church; then the presumption is greater, proportionable to the number of persons, that the three presentees framed their specifications legally, and that the eleven Bishops found him guilty justly! And this presumption is so strong in the minds of the editors of the Protestant Churchman, that they invite the General Convention not to look at the record, but to dismiss any appeal at once. Let us apply this reasoning to the third article of the Presentment. Bishop Onderdonk was acquitted on this article by a vote of 15 to 2, and according to the reasoning of our opponents the presumption is as 15 to 2, that he was innocent. Had the Bishop of Ohio and Vermont however alone constituted the Court then he would have been found guilty *unanimously*. Had we argued that this finding was against evidence we should have been gravely told that we had no business with it; and that the presumption in favor of the Bishops who tried him was two to one, and that we were impeaching the character of the Episcopal bench. But now as the vote stood 15 to 2, we may, thank heavens, find fault with the verdict, and say it was contrary to fact, and repugnant to the sense of the majority of the Court. Surely this finding on the part of the two prelates does not look like infallibility, even the editors of the Protestant Churchman being the judges.

With the same contemptuous disregard of law and logic, they argue that the issue now before the Church is, "that they [the fourteen Bishops] are the worst of men and consummate hypocrites," or upright judges who did not shrink from their duty, from fear of malice and calumny. The true issue before the Church is, "Are the trial and sentence of Bishop Onderdonk legal or illegal?" and that point I trust will be distinctly presented before the General Convention. Other collateral points will of course be overlooked, but they must not prevent or impede the course of justice. The conduct and motions of the members of the Court must be judged of from their official acts, when this question comes up, and men must not close their eyes to recorded facts, and say that *presumptions* are strong in favor of the Court.

The facetious writer of the editorial in question puts a supposed speech into the mouth of Bishop Onderdonk, consisting of several of the good things you have at sundry times served up to your readers, and containing the most undoubted but unpalatable truths, and then inquires "What would *be the response?*" Much would depend of course upon the tribunal to which it should be addressed. Were it addressed to an impartial tribunal like the Supreme Court of the United States for example, it would necessarily produce a most favorable effect, and probably lead to the immediate removal of the sentence. But since the appeal is to be made to the same body in part who passed the sentence, I opine that those who make it will not use *ad literam* Dr. Seabury's words. I trust that this assurance will set the mind of the erudite author at ease.

It is to be remembered, moreover, that Bishop Onderdonk is not the only party involved in this matter. If wrongs have been committed, and the laws of the Church violated in his case, every Clergyman is interested in obtaining redress. To him I say, remove the wholesome restraints of known and positive laws, and make holiness, or infallibility, or presumptions the rule of justice, and the measure of punishment, and who can predict the frightful results that will ensue. Innocence will be no protection, and our Constitution and Canons no safeguard. You in time may be "suspected of guilt," and conviction and punishment will forthwith follow. This rule of procedure being established, in the case of Bishop Onderdonk, you refuse to interpose because you believe that though illegally convicted "he has got his deserts." You will not interfere, because an opponent or an enemy is stuggling hopelessly in the strong grasp of irresponsible power, and fancying yourself secure you enjoy the spectacle—beware lest the measure you mete out to others be meted to you, and hopeless of redress you utter the piercing cries of woe and anguish within the fell talons of the destroyer. In the Western States it occasionally happens that some unpopular individual falls the victim of Lynch-law, and men believe him guilty, and each one says, I am a very worthy and moral citizen, no harm can happen to me, and I may as well join in the general applause. And so he does; and the next moment the rabble in their blind fury and holy zeal for the purification of the village or county, lay hold of him and hang him in spite of his cries and protestations! and leave it to after inquiry and information to prove innocence. Let Puritan principles once get the mastery in the Church, and Puritan vengeance range uncontrolled within her borders, and savage will be the watch-word, and exterminate the war-cry; and Evangelic truth will be supplanted by the dogmas of Geneva, and Apostolic order become a hissing and a bye-word; and the advocates of Catholic doctrine fall a sacrifice to men more evil than the noxious bird or the beast of prey. M. N.

For the Churchman.

Rev. and Dear Mr. Editor,—It has been announced in your paper, by the Agents of the Respective Societies, that the magnificent sum of ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS has been contributed by the Church of the Ascension in this city, to the Missionary Fund of the Diocese; and the *like liberal amount* to the New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society. As this Church contributed *nothing* to the Missionary Fund last year, this vast increase of liberality must gladden the heart of every Churchman, and reflect great credit on the Rector and congregation. The above, I understand, was a plate collection, and your readers will probably wish to know what plan was employed. I am informed on good authority that notice was given from the desk to the effect, that the collection, agreeably to the Canons, would be made for the benefit of the Missionary Fund of the Diocese, the N. Y. Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, and the New York Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, and that *all donations not specfiied for a particular object would be distributed under the authority of the Rector and Vestry.* When the receipts were got in, they construed this to mean that only the amounts *specifically given* were to go to the several societies above named, for whose benefit the collection was nominally made, and the rest, for it may in charity be supposed that the whole collection exceeded the amount of three dollars, went to parts and purposes unknown. The amount paid to the New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society is not large, but it shows the love which the Church of the Ascension bears to the Prayer Book, for I believe it has made a large donation to the American Bible Society, or some one or more of its branches. It is gratifying, however, to find it was promptly paid over; as a donation of more than double the value for the same Society from another Low Church congregation, contributed two years ago, has never been received by the agent to this day, (unless it has been paid very recently,) and nobody knows when it will be paid. When we consider that these pious, charitable, and liberal persons are the pre-eminently "moral portion of the community," the only real lovers of the Church and her "*masculine* system of doctrine," it must be allowed that they have a marvelous way of showing their love for the "Church of their affections." When, too, we consider that they "hold the purse string of the Diocese," we cannot but admire the tight grasp they keep on the precious deposit, and prophesy with the utmost confidence, that while they continue so prudent and cautious they will always have money in their purse. MASTIX.

P. S. If any part of the above statement is incorrect, it is of course undesigned, and will be promptly corrected on a due representation.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I am glad to find your able correspondent, "R. F. I.," animadverting with becoming plainness upon what has always appeared to me the most melancholy feature in the trial of Bishop Onderdonk—the utter absence of charity and compassion on the part of those who constituted the majority of the Court. It was to have been expected that as individuals who had, each for himself, so much reason to prefer the petition of the repentant publican, "GOD be merciful to me a sinner;" as disciples of HIM who said even to the woman taken in adultery, "Go, and sin no more;" and as fellow apostles with St. Paul, who having inflicted ecclesiastical discipline for a crime of so heinous a dye as not to be "so much as named among the gentiles," tenderly advised the former associates of the offender to forgive and comfort him lest he "should be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow;" it was to have been expected I say, that as men, as Christians, and as Bishops, they would have lent an unwilling and incredulous ear to the reports concerning their brother; that if forced to give reluctant credence to them, they would have deemed the remoteness of the period when the alleged misdemeanors were committed, and the nature of the domestic affliction under which he was then suffering, sufficient reasons for the postponement of any formal proceedings; that if the offences were of so definite and flagrant a character as to require interposition, they would have tried in the first instance the effect of private admonition, rather than bring upon the Church the disgrace of a public prosecution; and that if, lastly, the enormity of the charges imperiously required immediate arraignment, even under an ex post facto law, the unfriendly and prejudiced would have withdrawn, and the others would have entered upon the painful duty with pity and regret, the deeper from the eminent talents, learning, and services of the accused. That after the example of our civil courts, they would have shown him every reasonable indulgence in his defence; that they would have duly considered his avowal of innocence, and scanned the motives of his persecutors, given him the advantage of every doubt, the benefit of every favorable construction; and if, after all, they were compelled to pronounce him guilty, they would, in view of all the circumstances, have awarded as light a measure of punishment as would have satisfied the requirements of justice. This, Mr. Editor, is the course which humanity and Christianity would have dictated; and it would have repressed all murmuring and discontent. The Church would have vindicated her character, the ends of discipline would have been attained, and as, when one member suffers, the others suffer with it, all would have bowed themselves in sorrow and humiliation. How different the proceedure, your correspondent has forcibly portrayed; and without wishing to anticipate him in his series, I would invite his attention—and it is my immediate object in writing—to the conduct of those Bishops who, while they avowedly regarded suspension as the appropriate penalty, yet voted for deposition because of the difficulties in which suspension would involve the diocese! It should be our concern, Mr. Editor, to do our duty and let GOD take care of consequences. The heathen maxim, Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum, would have held them rigidly to that award which they believed to be due; Christian charity would have inclined them to the side of mercy;—forgetting both the justice of the heathen and the charity of the Christian, they gave their votes for wrong and oppression.

August 6, 1847. LAMBDA.

THE CHURCHMAN.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1847.

FLOYD SMITH, General Agent, No. 12 John-st up stairs

On comparing the Canon of 1844 for the trial of Bishops with the corresponding Canon of 1832 for the trial of Presbyters and Deacons, and looking at it in the light of what we believe to be sound principles of legislation, we had been inclined to think that the word *immorality* in the former Canon was intended to be taken in a limited and technical sense; that it was to be interpreted by the expre ssion *gross immorality* in the latter Canon, and so restrained as to embrace only instances of scandalous and disorderly conduct. We felt fortified in this view by the fact that several members of the Court, in their written opinions, have distinguished between offences and presentable offences; a distinction which would be quite untenable if the word *immorality* were made to embrace offences of every sort. A friend,* however, much better versed in such matters, suggests another construction which, if correct, lets in a ray of light on the Canon both as respects the motive of its framer and its operation. He supposes that the Canon authorizes the presentment of a bishop for *any* immorality; taking the word in its broad and popular sense, to denote all offences against the Divine Law, without reference to any authoritative standard to control the interpretation of that Law This construction of the Canon seems to us to be startling, and yet we dare not be positive that it is wrong. Nay rather, as matters now stand, and until the General Convention shall have repudiated it, we must acknowledge that the construction is right, and not only right but *authoritative;* inasmuch as it has been tacitly assumed and acted on, in several particulars, by the Presenters and the Court, whose proceedings have now passed into precedents and authority for the interpretation of the Canon in all future cases.†

We have before declared, and we now again declare our unmitigated detestation of the principle involved in this construction of the Canon, and in the Canon itself if this construction be authorized. There always have been, and there always will be, a large class of offences which may be safely left, and which ought to be left, to the law of private conscience and the law of reputation. Remorse and disappointment, the displeasure of ALMIGHTY GOD and the forfeiture of the good opinion of our fellow men, the one involving detriment, in various degrees, to our spiritual and the other to our temporal prospects, are what may be termed the *natural consequences* of these offences. Against these offences all society, civil and ecclesiastical, is sufficiently protected by their *natural consequences*, or those evils which follow them in the nature and constitution of things. Again there are other offences from which no society is sufficiently shielded by the law of conscience and the law of reputation, and against which every society needs to protect itself by special prohibitions with penalties annexed; and the sufferings incurred by the infraction of these laws, (which in ecclesiastical regimen are admonition, suspension and deposition) are strictly *penal consequences.* Now we contend that these two classes of offences ought to be clearly and broadly discriminated; that no member of society should be liable to the penal consequences of acts which are not precisely forbidden by laws previously promulgated, and that every member of society should be left free to do any thing not contrary to its laws, without the fear of any other than the natural consequences of the act itself. To deny this principle in theory and practice, to make men liable to presentment, trial and punishment, for acts which are either no violations, or at best but remotely constructive violations of previously defined and well known laws, is in effect to establish the inquisition in our midst. The exercise of such a power is tyranny, or constraint beyond the limits of law; the submission to it is slavery, or curtailment of liberty within the limits of law. Such a system puts every man's peace and reputation in jeopardy. It extinguishes all frank and generous energies, engenders mutual fears, suspicions and distrust, and moulds the character to adulation and servility. It opens the door to the fiercest dissensions; for when verdicts and penalties are left to depend not on the ascertainment of facts which carry conviction to all alike, but on the constructions and opinions of the judge, which are apt to strike men diversely and according to their individual temperaments or education, or the views of the sect or party to which they belong, they cannot but be a source of everlasting wrangling in every community in which they are promulged.

Whether all the alleged offences in the Presentment are such as may be safely left to the laws of conscience and reputation in Virginia, Tennessee and Georgia, we cannot say, being unwilling to judge of the condition of society in those states by the action of their bishops; but certain we are that the moral sentiment of the North and East is such that if Bishop Onderdonk had really been guilty of the pretended offences laid to his charge, instead of being enthusiastically sustained as he was for several years before his presentment by an overwhelming majority of his Diocese, he would have lost his standing and position in society; he would have been shunned by all decent men and decent women; he would have brought on himself inevitable exposure, and, in a word, would have been ruined by the natural consequences of his own acts. The Convention or the Standing Committee of the Diocese would have saved foreign bishops the trouble of interposing in its affairs; the verdict of the Court, if Court there had been, instead of preceding would have followed, instead of creating would have confirmed the verdict of the public; and as to the sentence, a punishment wisely and justly graduated to the offences might have exasperated the public sentiment by its leniency, but would never have shocked it by its severity.

These remarks are hardly a digression; they bear as on the whole presentment, so particularly on the third article, which, pursuing the argument commenced in our last number, we are next to examine.—The argument, is that as the Presentment charged immorality and impurity, every allegation contained in it ought to be specific and adequate to sustain the charge. We showed that in this, as well as in other respects, the ninth article was defective; that it was objectionable in its principle and ruinous in its operation. We now proceed to show the same in regard to the third and fourth articles, the former of which is as follows—

ARTICLE III.—And the said Bishops presenting do further present and allege, that on or about the first day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-eight, the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk, being then Bishop as aforesaid, was travelling in a public stage from Batavia, in the Diocese of New York, to Utica, in the same Diocese, for the purpose of attending a meeting of the Convention of said Diocese, then about to be held at Utica; that the only passengers in the said stage were the said Bishop and the Reverend James A. Bolles, and a young woman, to the said Presenting Bishops unknown, and whose name they are not able to furnish; that the said Bishop and young woman occupied the back seat, and the said James A. Bolles the middle seat of the said stage; that thereupon afterwards the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk impurely and unchastely put his arm around the body of the said young woman, and took other indecent liberties with her person; and behaved in so improper and unbecoming a manner that the said young woman endeavored to get beyond the reach of the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk, and finally, with a view to escape his rudeness, left the stage before reaching the place of her destination;—which said conduct of the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk the said Bishops present, as being contrary to his consecration vow in that behalf, and to the scandal and injury of the Church aforesaid.

The matter of this allegation, considered in itself and apart from its adventitious admixtures, is that the Respondent 1. *put his arm around the body of the said young woman*, and 2. *took indecent liberties with her person.*

The former of these allegations is neither definite nor adequate to sustain the charge of "Immorality and Impurity." It is definite as to the act, but not as to the object; for who was the young woman? For aught that appears to the contrary in the presentment, she may have been a sister of the Respondent, or have stood to him in some such relation as to justify the act. The witness relied on by the Prosecution to sustain this allegation, when asked by the Court, "Are you certain in your own mind that the Bishop did not know this lady?" answered, "I have never thought that he did, yet *I cannot say that he did not.*" Neither is the allegation adequate to the charge: for the act alleged is no proof of immorality but is, under many relations and circumstances, justifiable and even laudable. The allegation is mere food for suspicion.

If the former of these allegations had been adequate to the charge, there would have been meaning in the latter; viz. *took indecent liberties with her person.* But as this latter now stands it is vague and indefinite; it *specifies no offence* itself, and is connected with none which throws light on its meaning. The expression *indecent liberties* conjures up a thousand different phantoms to as many different minds. We have somewhere read of a clownish but good natured student, who, chancing to be in a polished circle, temerariously approached a young lady, and by a sudden movement of his hand, actually killed a musquitoe that was gorging on her bosom; to the infinite chagrin of the host and hostess, and the evident embarrassment of the company, who testified their various emotions, as was natural, some by a constrained smile, others by a contemptuous curl of the lip, and others again by a look of pity and disgust. This certainly was an "indecent liberty," and would be justly so regarded in all refined society. Of course the expression "*indecent liberties*" may mean something far more gross and offensive; but if it may mean this and a thousand other things, how is a Court to know what it does mean? and if the Court do not know the offence alleged, with what sense or reason can it proceed to try it? We are not versed in law; but common sense tells us that if a man is presented for trial, the offences alleged against him ought to be specified, and not referred to by a general expression which may mean any thing and every thing of an unbecoming nature, from an insult too gross to be tolerated down to the officious adjustment of a lady's shawl, the awkward tying of a shoe-string, or the killing of a musquitoe.

The ill use which may be made of these indefinite allegations in furthering the ends of *secret accusations*, shall be considered in connection with the next article. What we have said is enough, we think, to show that the third article was not proper for trial. The presentment and trial of any man on allegations which excite suspicions of guilt without being proofs of it, is an encroachment on his rights and liberty, and an assault on his reputation, for which there ought to be some means of redress, and which if not redressed must leave an indelible stigma on the society or church to which he belongs, and weaken the confidence of all its other members in the equity of its government and its power to protect *them* in the enjoyment of *their* rights

* See the communication of "Libra" in another column.

† "The writing of books or epistles under borrowed names," says Dr. Jortin as quoted by Richardson, "and imposing them as genuine on the public, is a thing of bad consequence and an *immorality*; yet it hath been done by men who, perhaps, in other respects were honest." Some in high stations have expressed, in even stronger language, their disapprobation of the manner in which our Church journals are conducted, and especially of the admission into them of anonymous contributions, and a General Canon, if we remember right, has been publicly proposed as a cure for the evil. But if the word *immorality* is to be taken in its broadest sense, the proposed end is gained already without the odium of an express canon to authorize it, and the censorship of the press may soon be in effective operation.

and reputation. This wrong has been done to the head of this Diocese, and the Diocese therefore is concerned in it; it has been done under the authority of the General Convention, and whether the fault lie in the Court or in the Canon under which it acted, the General Convention is equally responsible for it, and equally bound to repair it so far as it can be repaired, and to provide against the recurrence of like evils in future.

The fourth article contains an allegation which is at once definite and, in a very high degree, gross and offensive, though one against the perpetration of which the law of reputation affords, in our judgment, an ample security; an offence, we mean to say, which every woman, should it ever occur, would know how to resent, and the redress of which would be instant death to the reputation of the offender. The lady referred to in this article did not authorize the use of her name on the occasion, and after it had been used without her consent, she preferred a request, which the Court did not heed, to have it withdrawn from the proceedings. We do not know the lady, but our respect for the just sentiments of propriety and delicacy indicated by this request forbids us to quote the article, or even publicly to refer to it, without an expression of regret.

In this article the Presenters have made an allegation which has been productive of deep injury to the reputation of Bishop Onderdonk; an injury aggravated to the utmost degree by the publicity given to it by the Court. The allegation has done its work much more certainly than if the article containing it had been tried; for in the latter case the falsity of the allegation might have been shown, but now, though there is not a shadow of evidence in its support, men believe it, because (they say) the only reason for its not being proved was that the witness did not appear. This is natural; the allegation rests on the authority of three bishops, who are sure to be believed by the generality when they speak ill of one of their own order. The presenters have thus made a ruinous charge, which they have failed to support. They may say indeed that the witness on whom they relied refused to appear, and that the Court had not the power to compel her attendance. But what right had they to rely on this witness? The use of her name (as appears pp. 139, 140, of the Trial) was "altogether unauthorized" by herself and by those who had the right to speak for her, and therefore no statements or complaints were made by her or them directly to the Presenters. The Church certainly could not have authorized them to rely on a witness whose presence it had not, by the confession of the Court itself, (see Trial, p. 50,) the power to compel. The law of the land could not have authorized (even if it permitted) them to give a most painful, and possibly injurious, notoriety to the name of a lady without any sanction from herself or her rightful representatives, or even from the Church to which the presenters belonged. What right then, we ask, had the presenting bishops to rely on this witness? And if they had none, then they have failed, *through their own fault*, to support the allegation, and ought to be held responsible for its injurious consequences.

But worse than this; the presenters have not only failed to produce their witness, but they have not given the name of their informant. "Who can defend himself from calumny, armed with that impenetrable shield of tyranny, secrecy?" It would be well, we think, for members of the ensuing General Convention to ponder this question of a well known author. The Presenting Bishops were not the accusers; they were commissioners acting under a canon of the General Convention, and they have preferred a charge against a brother bishop founded, as respects this article of the Presentment, on the accusations of others. The charge has been preferred under a canon of the General Convention, and to this day the name of the accuser is not known.

Nor is this the only one; the third and the ninth articles of the Presentment, as well as the fourth, are all founded on *secret accusations*. The junior counsel for the Respondent very strongly and justly objected to the course of the Prosecution for having founded all its Articles but one upon mere rumor or hear-say evidence as "revolting to my [Mr. Graham's] sense, at least, of what is due to the character and rights of every citizen, and as a circumstance which, if it had occurred in a civil tribunal, would have been frowned upon most indignantly by the Court." The Presenters, however, gave up the names and affidavits on which they have grounded the 1st, 2d, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th articles of the presentment; but in regard to the three remaining articles they have followed a worse model even than the parliament of Toulouse,* having not even to this day given up the names of the persons on whose affidavits or statements they have founded these articles. The third article is referred to by Bishop Ives, incidentally, in his Opinion on the case, as having been founded on an affidavit of Dr. Hawks; but this was merely a presumption of Bishop Ives; there was no proof of the fact before the Court. A motion was made by the counsel for the Respondent to obtain the affidavits of the witnesses examined and to be examined, and even this was refused by the Court as a right, though afterwards accorded by the Presenters as a favor. But the affidavits or original statements on which the third, fourth and ninth articles are founded, were not demanded, and the Presenters have never given up the names of their authors. The affair has been managed in secrecy, the Presenters having entertained secret information, and the authors of the affidavits or statements having been secret informers. We do not mention this with a view to impute blame to the parties or to cast odium on them; but merely to direct attention to what seems to us to be a grave defect in the Canon, and to bespeak a favorable consideration for Bishop Onderdonk, who has been impeached in these three articles on the representation of secret informers. What man's reputation can stand such an ordeal?

Behold now the manner in which vague and indefinite expressions may be made to further the end of secret accusations. In the examination of these proceedings we have made it a rule to refer to no fact or incident within our knowledge which could not be ascertained from the Record. But there are exceptions to all rules, and we make an exception to this in regard to facts which are part of the proceedings, and to which the public have as much claim as to any other, and which it was the right of the Respondent on this Trial to know, and to have the Court and the public know. We affirm then, and challenge contradiction to the fact, not only that Dr. Hawks made an affidavit on which the third article of the presentment was founded, but that a part of the affidavit was in these words,—"That suddenly turning around to speak to the Bishop, he [Mr. Bolles] perceived that the young woman had drawn herself into the corner of the seat, as if to escape from the Bishop, while he had one arm around her body, and his other hand was placed in an indecent manner either upon her breasts, or about her ———, I cannot positively say which, but it was one or the other." Now here the presenters had before them a definite statement; why then have they used the vague one of "indecent liberties?" Not from modesty; for in the first, seventh and eighth articles they have been disgustingly particular. But to sustain these they had as witnesses the wives of the persons who made them, while in regard to the third article they had to depend on one whom, though within their reach, they did not consult. Were the Presenters themselves, then, afraid that their allegations might not be sustained by their own witness? Did they think it best to avoid particulars as much as possible in order that if the calumnies which they had gathered should not be supported by their witness, their own exposure might not be too flagrant and manifest? "Indecent liberties" was just the expression to suit such a purpose: if their secret information were correct their vague allegation might convict the Respondent of guilt; if incorrect it would save themselves.

* "The parliament of Toulouse hath a very singular custom relative to the validity of evidence. In other places demiproofs are admitted, which is a palpable absurdity, there being no such thing as demi-truth; but at Toulouse, they admit of quarters and eighths of a proof. For instance, an hear-say may be considered as a quarter, and another hear-say, more vague than the former, as an eighth; so that eight hear-says, which in fact are no other than the echo of a groundless report, constitute a full proof. Upon this principle it was that poor Calas was condemned to the *wheel*."—*Beccaria.*

We have admitted the article on Kemper College with reluctance, partly because we can ill spare the room at present, and partly because the subject, in its minute details, is void of interest to the greater portion of our readers. Nor are we certain that its insertion could have been *justly* expected of us. For what are the facts? An attack was made on Bishop Hawks and his friends, by the Episcopal Recorder, charging them with having deliberately ruined the College by their reckless determination to have either a College of a *particular ecclesiastical complexion*, or none at all; which particular ecclesiastical complexion was stated to be in opposition to the views of those who had mainly contributed to the establishment of the College—in opposition also to a clear and decided Gospel, and in furtherance of the worst errors of Oxford. It was impossible for men to be silent under so gross a charge, and we could neither refuse our columns to Mr. Griswold, nor withhold our sympathies from him and Mr. Cressey, when they offered their able and indignant vindication. Mr. Hutchinson's agency in the matter has been but a collateral issue to the main question, and for this reason as well as for the reason that we inserted Mr. Griswold's communication as an act of defence against an unprovoked aggression, we think that we were not bound in strict justice, to insert the article on our first page; the writers of which have let go the main issue and the Episcopal Recorder, and undertaken simply the defence of Mr. Hutchinson. Their communication should have been made to the Episcopal Recorder and not to us. It must be owned, however, that Mr. Hutchinson's reputation was seriously implicated in Mr. Griswold's communication, and as in such a matter we cannot consent to rest under even the semblance of an imputation of the want of fairness, we have determined, at whatever inconvenience, to admit the explanations and defence which are made in his behalf. The letter purports to be "introductory," but the introduction is of course to be understood with reference to letters which are to find publicity in some other way than through the Churchman.

Bishop Hawks and his friends in Missouri, may be assured of our entire and cordial sympathy with them in the main issue of this controversy; and if Mr. Hutchinson's agency in the matter can be set in a light creditable to himself as a man and a Churchman, we shall not only rejoice ourselves, but shall feel confident that they too will participate in the same sentiment.

For the Churchman.

DIOCESE OF INDIANA.

From the following letter addressed to the Committee appointed to inform the Rev. Dr. Bowman of his election to the Episcopate of Indiana, it will be perceived that that gentleman does not accept of the office to which he has been chosen. C.

Lancaster, *Aug.* 2, 1847.

Rev. and dear Brethren:

I have received your official communication informing me of my election as Bishop of the Diocese of Indiana.

I need not say that the announcement came upon me with all the suddenness of a surprise; and I beg to assure you that I receive it with all the grateful sentiments suited to an honor so unexpected, and I must add, so undeserved.

And yet, my dear Brethren, I have received yonr communication with extreme pain; because I cannot persuade myself, that I am in any just measure fitted for the difficult and responsible post to which I am invited—and because it grieves me deeply to think of the disappointment and embarrassment which I may occasion by declining.

But with my present views, what other course is left me? If it were a mere question of personal sacrifices, I hope, by God's grace, I should be able to make them for the Church's sake. But on that head, you have left me no room to object. The provision promised for my support, seems to me generous and ample; and in the assurances you give me of a cordial and hospitable reception everywhere, you forestall every objection that might be urged on the score of personal and domestic comfort.

My difficulties are of an entirely different character. I have a deep—I believe unconquerable persuasion, that I am not fitted for the station, and that my acceptance of it would result in disappointment to the Diocese, and in a series of mortifications to myself, so bitter aud humiliating, that I have not courage to contemplate, still less to encounter them. To see the Diocese languishing or suffering from this inefficiency on my part to find myself in a position to whose duties I should prove unequal, but from which I could not retire, would distress me so acutely, that I cannot consent to place myself where I should run such a hazard.

In addition to these profound convictions of personal disqualification, must be mentioned, what seems to me a very important fact, viz., that I am entirely unacquainted with Western society and manners—its modes of thought, feeling and action. My life, indeed, has been beyond the common measure a secluded one. The last twenty years of it have been passed in a single Parish of no great extent, whilst my natural disposition and habits have kept me from acquiring that kuowledge of men and manners, which seems to me nearly indispensable in a Bishop. I have now passed that period of life, when the character loses its pliancy, and when one is no longer able, as in more youthful years, to adapt himself to new scenes, habits and associations. Nor am I conscious of any desire or aspiration towards a wider or more dignified sphere of labor than the humble one which I now occupy—which is quite equal to my abilities and my ambition—is endeared to me by a thousand recollections of sorrow and of joy, and where my hope is—if it please God—after an obscure, but not wholly useless life, to sleep beside my own dead, in the quiet churchyard which contains their ashes.

My chief anxiety now is, that my motives in declining the Episcopate of Indiana, may not be misunderstood. I am not conscious of the influence of any, but those which I have expressed. The convictious which I have uttered, however, are deep and settled.

Nothing therefore remains but to thank your Convention, as I do most heartily, for the honor they have done me—yourselves, brethren, for the kind manner in which you have announced their choice to me—to assure you of the lively interest which I shall not cease to feel in your young but hopeful Diocese, and of my deep regret that I should have been, however involuntarily, the cause of a moment's embarrassment to you, and to pray that God may speedily send you a Bishop equal at once to the just expectations of the Diocese, and the great demands of the Episcopate.

I remain, Rev. and dear Brethren, with sentiments of the sincerest respect and regard,

Your friend and brother,

S. BOWMAN.

The Rev. Messrs. Crowes, Killikelly, and Harrison—Committee, &c.

The Eye: *Its imperfections, and their prevention; by James W. Powell, M. D. Published by the Author, No. 261 Broadway.*

This volume comes to confer a special benefit upon the public; and it cannot be otherwise than serviceable to all except those who unhappily are entirely blind. The author has here given the results of much observation and practice; unveiling the mysteries of his art with a most philanthropic determination to do good. The information obtained from this work will prove a manifold return for the trifling price, and it may be the means of preserving a treasure which money cannot buy.

The Life of Mrs. Godolphin, by John Evelyn, of Wootton, Esq., *Now first published and edited by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford, Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.* D. Appleton & Co., 12mo., pp. 167.

One cannot avoid reverting to "The Diary of Lady Willoughby," when a work so much resembling it is brought to one's notice. This, however, has the recommendation of being a veritable and authentic biography, and its quaintnesses of being natural and unsolicited. It describes the godly conversation of a true daughter of the Anglican Church placed in the midst of one of the most corrupting of courts, but maintaining an unsullied purity, and advancing to an almost saintly perfection. For purposes of edification it is not inferior to "English Churchwomen of the Seventeenth Century," and may be read with pleasure and profit. The style, it is true, is unusual, and even the peculiarities in spelling of the last century are rigidly retained, but these detract little from the interest which it inspires.

Men, Women and Books, *a selection of sketches, essays and critical memoirs, from his uncollected prose writings. By Leigh Hunt.* Harper & Brothers, 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 280 and 297.

The admirers of Leigh Hunt's peculiar style and temper, his good-humor, and somewhat cockneyish gossip of what he sees and reads, will accept with pleasure the two volumes which are here offered them. They have been made up of articles originally published in several of the English journals, and are here reprinted in a very handsome form. A portrait of the author, *æt.* 36, is prefixed to the first volume, adding little however to its value.

The same publishers have also issued "Summer Tours, or Notes of a Traveller through some of the Middle and Southern States, by Theodore Dwight," (12mo. pp. 252) and "Beauties of the Bible by Ezra Sampson," (18mo. pp. 366.)

DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

CONFIRMATIONS AND OTHER SERVICES BY BISHOP DE LANCEY IN THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

July 27. In Christ Church, Morristown, St. Lawrence county, preached and confirmed *nine* persons.

July 28. In St. John's Church, Ogdensburgh, preached and confirmed *forty-one* persons.

July 29. In Grace Church, Canton, preached and confirmed *two* sick persons in private.

July 29. In Trinity Church, Potsdam, in the afternoon preached and confirmed *eleven* persons, including one from Grace Church, Canton.

July 30. At Norfolk, preached in the Presbyterian House of Worship, and confirmed *three* persons, and after the service laid the corner-stone of Grace Church.

July 30. In St. Paul's Church, Waddington, in the afternoon preached and confirmed *ten* persons.

Bishop DeLancey's services have been held in about ninety parishes of the Diocese, exclusive of the sixteen visited by him last year.

New York.—*Laying of the Corner-stone of Grace Church, Norfolk, St. Lawrence county.*—On the morning of Friday, July 30th, the Right Rev. William H. De Lancey, D. D., attended by the following clergy, Rev. Messrs. Atwater, Hubbard, and Hanson of the Diocese of New York; Rev Messrs. Patton and Boswell of the Diocese of Toronto; and Rev. Mr. Gregory, deacon, proceeded to the Presbyterian House of Worship, in the village of Norfolk. Morning prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Patton, and the lessons read by the Rev. Mr. Hubbard. The psalms and lessons appropriate for the laying of a corner-stone were used. The Bishop then confirmed three persons, and preached, from Matt. xiii. 19, a sermon adapted to the two solemnities of the day—the rite of Confirmation and the laying of a Corner-stone. During service it began to rain violently, and at its conclusion, after a short delay, finding the storm did not abate, the Bishop, accompanied by the Missionary, and followed by the rest of the clergy, the vestry, and a very large share of the congregation, proceeded to the Church-yard, at the entrance of which the 122d Psalm was begun and repeated responsively as the procession advanced towards the foundation of the Church. It continued raining during the solemnity, but the whole assembly, including many ladies, stood devoutly around the Bishop, who occupied a place near the Corner-stone at the North-east of the Chancel.

In the course of the service the Senior Warden read a list of the documents deposited beneath the Corner-stone, and when the latter was fixed firmly in its position, the Bishop laid it with the usual solemnities in the name of the Holy Trinity.

The Missionary then delivered the following Address:

Rt. Rev. Father in God, Rev. Brethren, Christian Friends, and good people,—It is very meet and right that all our acts should be begun, continued and ended, in God, from whom alone we can obtain grace and power to perform them to His glory. We have to-day laid the corner-stone of an edifice which is to be devoted to His service, the teaching of His Truth, and the administration of His Sacraments. And therefore have we approached Him with prayer in the humble hope that He will prosper this our undertaking for His Son's sake, and make His favor and blessing to rest upon us.

In the box which we have deposited beneath this stone, we have placed—1. A copy of the Holy Bible, to signify our unfaltering faith in the undying word which our Heavenly Father has given to be a light to our feet and a lantern to our paths; and our desire to bring every thought, word, and deed to conformity with its sacred teaching. 2. A copy of the Book of Common Prayer in testimony of our steadfast adherence to the Faith once delivered to the saints; and to the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which it is evident to all men diligently reading Scripture and ancient authors, hath been from the Apostles' times in Christ's Church, and of our resolution, with God's assistance, to comply with all the ordinances of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church into which we have been baptized, and in whose communion we trust to die, "in the confidence of a certain faith, in the comfort of a reasonable, religious, and holy hope, in favor with God, and in perfect charity with the world." 3 Copies of the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and of the Diocese of New York, together with the last journals of the General and Diocesan Conventions, in token of our conviction that the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country is a pure branch of Christ's holy Church throughout the world, and of our determination to obey its regulations and advance its interests. 4. Copies of the Churchman and of the Gospel Messenger, which have been the able and fearless asserters in this and the sister Diocese of Western New York, of evangelical truth and order. And, lastly, a brief statement, which I will in this place read, of the past struggles of the Church in this parish, which, although possessing the years of age, is still clad in the garments of infancy. In future times when the bones of many of us shall have mouldered around these walls, and the walls themselves shall have shared the fate of their erectors, a simple record of this kind may not be without interest for those who shall come after. The document runs thus:

"In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost Amen."

The past history of the Church in this parish presents a long series of patient efforts to establish the Truth in the midst of difficulty and opposition. The settlement of the village was begun in the year 1816. And as soon after as circumstances would allow, the upper story of a Grist Mill was fitted up for Divine Worship by the Hon. Russel Atwater,* who at an advanced age is still a member of the Vestry Here he officiated as a lay reader for some years at intervals, and succeeded in making a few individuals acquainted with the doctrines of the Church of Christ. Among them, it is believed, was one who is now an able and honored Bishop of the Church.†

The parish of Grace Church, Norfolk, was first organized in the year 1825, by the Rev. Seth W. Beardsley, then acting as Missionary in the county, who made an effort, which proved abortive, to build a Church. He was succeeded in the year 1827–8 by the Rev. Hiram Adams, and by the Rev. Henry S. Atwater in 1829. From July, 1830, to March, 1842, the public services of the Church were discontinued, with the exception of occasional lay reading; and owing to the want of a clergyman, and the removal of several families, the organization of the parish was lost. A re-organization took place in 1842, when the Rev. John A. Childs, Missionary, began to officiate. He continued to do so for two years. During this time another effort was made to build a Church, but failed. In 1845 the Rev. J. H. Hanson, the present Missionary, was engaged by the parish.

The want of a place for public worship has been the great drawback to the growth of the Church, and the Missionary and Vestry have determined, with God's assistance, to rear a Temple to His service, and the maintenance of His Truth.

They begin this work in faith, with prayer, trusting that the grace of God will move with a spirit of love and liberality the hearts of their brethren in more prosperous portions of His Vineyard, and will also give them strength to proceed in their undertaking with perseverance and energy.

The future Church, the Corner-stone of which is to-day laid, will be cruciform, and have an open roof. The size of the nave and chancel, 62 feet by 22 feet, and the transepts from end to end, 50 feet by 14 feet. The tower will stand at the north of the Chancel, and there will be a porch at the south of the nave. The foundation is on the solid rock, and at the entrance of the Church, where the font is to be placed, there is a durable spring of water, gushing through the Rock. The seats are to be free.

This Corner-stone is laid on Friday,
July 30th, in the year of our Lord, 1847,
By the Right Rev. W. H. DeLancey, D. D.,
Bishop of Western New York.
The Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D.,
Bishop of the Diocese.
Rev. John H. Hanson, Missionary.
Phineas Atwater, Sylvester Foord—*Wardens.*
Russel Atwater, Arba Robinson, Samuel Browning, Edward M. Shepherd, Henry P. Judson, Henry A. Wetmore, T. N. F. Winslow—*Vestry.*

"Except the Lord build the House, they labor in vain that build it." Ps. 127. i.

Brethren,—In places where worldly wealth is given to the Church, the building of a House of God, though a solemn and an affecting, is not felt to be an arduous task. Piety speaks the word—and the fretted roof and marble pinacles mount into the skies. But in remote spots like this, the case is different. There, often, the one great earthly hope of the Christian from youth to old age is to possess a simple village Church, in which to worship with decency and order the God of his Fathers. He hears of the prosperity of the Church in more favored regions, and rejoices. But around him is gloom. Attempt after attempt is made to accomplish the object so ardently desired, and repeated failure at length almost begets the belief of its impossibility. Such has been our situation. And we now recommence our task at once with trust and in trembling. But let us not for a moment entertain the fear of ultimate disappointment. Sacrifices we must make of time and labor and substance. But if we persevere God will assuredly bless our efforts.

It is the destiny of the Church of Christ on earth to be constantly suffering, and yet through suffering, to triumph. Trace down her history from the days when the Incarnate God trod the earth, and you will find the Cross stamped on every page; and that man, therefore, has yet to learn the alphabet of his vocation as a Christian, who expects to accomplish any good and holy end without pain and toil. "Christ went not up to joy, but first He suffered pain; He entered not into His glory, but first He was crucified. So truly our way to eternal joy is to suffer here with Christ."

This is the thought which as disciples of the Crucified, we must carry with us in every event of life, great or small, of a public, or of a private nature. And knowing this, and taking up our Cross with cheerful hearts we must not be dismayed, by distractions in the Church, oppositions from the world, divisions in families, difficulties in parishes, denial or paucity of religious privileges, but on the contrary thank God that notwithstanding all, our blessings are so many, and our sorrows so few; and labor on amid the mingled light and darkness of our lot, believing that at even time there will be light.

But let us remember also that God requires pure hands and hearts of those who rear His Temples. The pious aspirations of David to build a House for God were not granted during his life time on account of his past criminality. And thus, brethren, most of our failures and disappointments in this world proceed from our sins. May God grant that we, and all others who seek to dedicate Temples to His Name, may have grace unreservedly to dedicate ourselves to Him, and to be mindful of those words of the apostle, "Know ye not that your body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and your spirit which are God's."

Brethren, we have laid this Corner-stone in the Name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

We have laid this Corner-stone in the Faith of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

We have laid this Corner stone as the beginning of a House of Prayer.

We have laid this Corner-stone as the beginning of a Church wherein those who are born in sin and the children of wrath are to be regenerated and born again of water and the Holy Ghost, and made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven.

We have laid this Corner-stone as the beginning of a Church, in which those to whom the remembrance of sin is grievous, and the burden intolerable, may come with a hearty repentance and true faith, and at God's altar, eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood that their sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and their souls washed through His most precious blood.

We have laid this Corner-stone as the beginning of a sacred school wherein the young of Christ's flock are to be catechised in the Christian faith and taught their duty to God and to their neighbor.

On this spot through future generations is the truth to be preached, and the faith earnestly contended for. Here sinners are to be converted to God, and His servants stirred up by being put in remembrance of their duty.

Hither are the dead, in Christ, to be brought in shroud and winding sheet to receive the last solemnities of the Catholic Church.

Around these walls are they to repose each in the solemn stillness of his narrow house, waiting for the trump of the Archangel and the voice of God.

Upon the sod on which you tread the tears of mourners are to fall, and from thence upward is the eye of faith to look, while faltering lips repeat the words, "I am the resurrection and the life saith the Lord; he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

There are no graves here yet—but thick the sheeted dead shall lie—and thick the hillocks be heaped together, and the tomb-stones stand—*the tombs of the baptized and the faithful!* "I heard a voice from Heaven saying unto me, Write, from henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; even so saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labors."

By laying this Corner-stone we have taken possession of this ground in the Name of the Lord of Hosts. And may He, in His infinite mercy, grant that it shall be a centre from which holy influences are henceforth to spread, and on which heavenly blessings are to rest. May the impure here be purified! May the impenitent be here penetrated with contrition! May the unbelieving here learn faith—and the unforgiving love! May the sorrowing servants of a crucified Saviour here obtain that peace which the world cannot give, and from age to age may redeemed sinners here say, with heartfelt utterance, the words we have to-day used, "I was glad when they said unto me we will go into the House of the Lord. Our feet shall stand in thy gates, O Jerusalem. O pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee."—Ps. 122.

When the address was concluded, the choir being unable to sing in consequence of the storm, the Bishop offered prayer and pronounced the benediction. The procession then moved out of the Church-yard in the order in which they entered, and separated.

At 4 o'clock of the same day, the Rt. Rev. Bishop DeLancey preached and administered the rite of confirmation to ten persons in St. Paul's Church, Waddington. Prayer was offered from the altar by the Rev. Mr. Patton of the Diocese of Toronto, and the lessons were read by the Rev. Mr. Gregory, Deacon. There were also present the Rev. J. H. Hanson, rector, and the Rev. Mr. Boswell of the Diocese of Toronto.

Kentucky.—The Nineteenth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Kentucky was held in Christ Church, Louisville, on the 13th, 14th, and 15th of last May. It was attended by the Bishop, 12 of the clergy, and 23 delegates from different parishes. The Standing Committee elected consists of the Rev. Messrs. Berkley, Craik and Gallagher, and Messrs. Bullock and Pettit. The delegates to the General Convention are, clerical, J. B. Gallagher, James Craik, G. G. Moore, and E. F. Berkley, lay, Messrs. Bodley, Bucklin, Bullock, and Craig. One church was admitted into union with the Convention. Baptized (infants 164, adults 29) 193; confirmed 117; communicants (lost 54, gained 112) 730; Marriages 44; Burials 64; Sunday scholars 215; contributions $3,897. Two deacons have been ordained.

The following is extracted from page 12 of the Journal:

The Rev. Mr. Craik, Chairman of a Committee appointed at the last Convention "to report to the next [this] Convention, such changes or alterations" in the Canon of the last General Convention in relation to the ordination of Deacons, "as may be deemed expedient to recommend to this Convention, and through it to the General Convention," made the following report:

That the VIth Canon of the General Convention of 1844, is admirably designed, and evidently looks to the relief of some of the pressing wants of the Church in the United States. The passage of such a Canon was therefore gratifying, as affording evidence that the minds of Churchmen, generally, had been turned to the consideration of the best means of supplying the class of Ministers contemplated by that Canon. But, unfortunately, the restrictions which it seemed right to the General Convention to attach to the admission of this class of Ministers, have rendered the Canon altogether inoperative.

The exigencies of the Church require two classes of clergymen at all times. The Church needs a body of clergy profoundly learned, and trained from early childhood in those classical attainments, which can only be secured by the sons of the wealthy.

The Church equally demands for the fulfilment of her great commission, the services of men not thus favored in early youth; but who have been formed by the discipline of practical life to a strong and vigorous apprehension of truth, and to the capacity of presenting it to other minds.

The first class of clergymen will always be found in some proportion where the facilities for classical education exist, and where the means of a thorough theological education are provided by the Church.

The second class of Clergy will best be provided for, by more fully admitting into the administration of the Church, the principle which is essential to the working of all other governments—the principle of Trust and Responsibility.

The necessities of the Church, growing out of the command of her Divine Lord, require that this trust and responsibility should be, at least in some small degree, increased. The power of the Chief Shepherd's of Christ's flock may indeed be abused, but no power can be conferred which is not liable to abuse; and surely, the General Convention has placed a sufficient limitation, when it has provided the complex machinery of Vestries, Rectors of Parishes, and the Standing Committee, to stand between the Bishop and the Candidates for Ordination, and to sift the character and qualifications of those who are to be admitted to Holy Orders. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the General Convention be respectfully requested, by this Convention, to repeal all the special restrictions contained in the VIth Canon of 1844.

Notices.

☞ St. Barnabas's Church, (seats free,) in 27th street between 2d and 3d Avenues, is open for Divine Worship every Sunday at 10 1-2 A. M, and 4 P. M., and for Sunday School at 2 P. M.

All who are friendly to the support of *Free Churches*, are respectfully invited to attend.

Donations for this church are earnestly solicited. It is the *only* church in a wide range of population where the seats are all free. Brethren, we feel the importance of sustaining this enterprise, and we feel our weakness too. We want aid. Our hands must be held up, or the only church for the *poor*, whom Christ said "we have always with us," must be closed, and they left to wander as sheep having no shepherd. Brethren, will you let us cry unto you in vain?

We are very much in want of a communion set, and a small organ, the donors of which would receive the blessing of this infant parish.

☞ Contributions for this church may be left with Floyd Smith, Esq., at the office of the Churchman, or at the residence of the Rector, Rev. Hiram Jelliff, corner of 31st street and 1st Avenue.

New York Institution for the Blind.—The next session will commence on Wednesday, September 1st, when it is expected that all the pupils will have returned to resume their places in the classes.

Those intending to become pupils would do well to enter the Institution at that time. The expenses of board and tuition exclusive of clothing are $130 a year. Blind persons between the ages of 8 and 25, whose friends may be unable to support them at the Institution, may be appointed state pupils by forwarding to the Superintendent of Common Schools at Albany, a certificate signed by the overseers of the poor, stating the fact of permanent blindness, the age and moral character of the pupil, and the pecuniary inability of friends.

☞ Editors in the country will confer a favor upon the blind by publishing the above.

Washington and other Poems. By Cynthia Bullock, a graduate of the New York Institution for the Blind. For sale at this office. Price 50 cts.

New York, May 15, 1847—tf

Emmanuel Free Church—Corner of Prince and Thompson streets.—This Church is open for Divine service on Sundays at the following hours—10 1-2 A.M., and 4 P. M.,

The third service to be discontinued until further notice.

New York, July 10th, 1847.

ST. SIMON'S FREE GERMAN CHURCH.
Houston street, between Pitt and Ridge streets.
Rev. Thomas Cook, Minister.

Divine service is regularly held in the above church every Sunday morning at half-past 10, and half-past 7 i the evening.

Friends of the church acquainted with the German language are affectionately and earnestly invited to attend.

The Sunday school, which is composed exclusively of German children, commences at 9 A. M., and 2 P. M. The instruction is imparted in the English language. Teachers are very much needed.

June 5, 1847.

Acknowledgments.

Domestic Missions.—Since his acknowledgment of the 3d August, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From St Paul's, Glen Cove, L I, 4; St James's ch, Newtown, L I, for Ohio, 11 75; St Ann's, Lowell, 60; Beaufort, S C, Laids, W.——, S.——, for missions in one of the far South Slave-holding Statas, 250; through J K Sass, R A in S C, St Pnilip's, Charlestown, for Bishop Kemper's Mission, 34; for Bishop Freeman's, 50; for the Jews, 2 69; Mis Dorothy Richardson, for the West, 10—96 69. Total, $418 44.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
New York, August 10, 1847. 139 Broadway.

New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums,

From Rev Charles H Hall, for Prayer Books, at Huntington, L I, $3; Rev J M Willey, Missionary, Stonington, Ct, 2; Rev James P F Clarke, subscriber, 2. Total amount, $7.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
Thomas C Butler, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, August 10, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Tract Society.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From Ascension Parish, Carol co, Maryland, Rev D H Buel, $3 63.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
Thomas C. Butler, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street
New York, August 10, 1847.

Died,

On Friday morning, the 6th inst., Charles Theodore, Son of Thomas B. and Almira H. Coddington, aged six months and ten days.

A more crushing affliction than that sustained by Mr. and Mrs. Coddington is seldom recorded. Of a promising and most interesting family of five children, one only remains; the rest having been in the course of one short month swept away, amid intense bodily suffering, by that ruthless scourge and baffler of the medical art, the scarlet fever. In connexion with this record occurs also the recollection of a most estimable clergyman, formerly of this Diocese, the Rev. Joseph F. Philips, whose children have been taken from him at the like early age, and the death of the last of whom was but recently recorded in our Journal.

There is that in such bereavments which speaks most touchingly to parent's, and in a language which parents only can adequately understand. Children are little heeded by the world; their life is unseen by it, their death scarcely noted. To the parent they are themselves a world; or rather a microcosm in which he may ever trace, and by tracing renew in his own heart the image and memento of that simplicity and innocence which reigned in the world before sin had entered to mar its beauty and to disturb its peace. No joys on this earth so pure, no rest so refreshing as that of the father who leaves the toils, strifes and perturbations of the day, to bathe his wearied spirit in the smiles and glee of children, the pledges of the love of one who alone in life is dearer to him than themselves. No provision more wonderful, more beautiful, when subordinated to the economy of Divine Grace, for the renovation of man's fallen nature. Inscrutable, then, as respects the parent, is the providence which desolates his home and deprives him of the solace of his children, and leaves him only the memory of their joys. But not inscrutable, as respects those who are taken from his earthly embrace. "From henceforth, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord," is the voice from heaven which assures us of their joy and felicity. For they surely "die in the Lord" and enter into his rest and blessedness, who have been baptized into Christ, and who leave this world of sin and sarrow in all the freshness of their new creation. They, at least, have never forfeited the infinite blessings of the Redemption and Regeneration procured for them and bestowed upon them by the Son and Holy Spirit. Bereaved and yet not bereaved, but still knitted to their children in the communion of Saints, Christian parents should rejoice that they have laid up for themselves treasures in heaven, that they have added new inmates to the abode of the blessed, and new accessions to its joys. Whether in life, then, or in death they and their children are the care of that good and gracious Father who, through the atonement of His Son and the energy of His Spirit, is preparing them for "an inheritance undefiled which passeth not away,"

At Astoria, L. I., on the 9th inst., Mr. Robert Wardell, in the 81st year of his age—formerly an old inhabitant of this city.

To Correspondents.

"W. J." is received.

We ask the indulgence of "Contributor" this week, and shall endeavor not again to interrupt his valuable series. We regret very much that we cannot accede to the proposal of "E." (not the same who has long used this signature in our columns.)

"W. A. J." in our next.

"X. Y. Z." in our next.

"Vindicator," promised this week, is unavoidably deferred for want of room. "Observation" is received.

Advertisements.

Mrs. Okill having announced in her School Circular, July 10, 1847, a departure from what has been, for many years, the *School Term* of her establishment,—taking for it the period between Snpt. 1st and June 30th, instead of as formerly, from Sept. 15th to July 31st,—here presents, to the parents and guardians of her pupils, the following reasons for it.

1. The custom among some heads of families of spending, with their children, a part of the summer in the country, which, formerly limited to a few, and confined to a short period, is now almost general, and extends in many cases, through the entire months of July and August, has, with it, introduced corresponding modifications in domestic and business relations of all kinds; and in none have changes, to meet the salutary habit, become more indispensable than in school arrangements; in the well-working of which so much depends upon keeping the classes together, to attain through instruction, and to promote a healthful emulation.

2. The *necessity* for a systematic and uniform course, presenting to the mind of instructor and pupil equally a character of oneness, in which a well defined goal must be reached before completeness can be attained, is in no department of life more urgent than in that of instruction. Without this characteristic, education looses its chief end: *the establishment of orderly habits of mind and body, and the faculty of bending, at pleasure, the powers of each to the will.* How far unbroken attendance upon school duties, until their completion, must tend to fix these habits, and to prevent the formation of their opposites, and particularly to the one most fatal to the comfort of the individual as well as of others—*desultoriness*—need not be insisted on with any well-informed person.

3. The bond of sympathy between instructor and pupil, which, although to some it may seem of minor consideration, is of truly great importance, both to moral and intellectual development, is greatly strengthened by the two remaining together during the entire course. If the pupil knows she may be taken from school at any moment, and the instructor has the same prospect, the one is kept in a state of mind the least teachable, aud most unfavorable to steady application, whilst the other is as naturally rendered anxious, lest the sole reward that can compensate for the wearisome toil of teaching, the consciousness of having been instrumental in fulfilling the hopes of parents, by presenting to them a well trained mind, may unthinkingly be snatched away when nearly earned.

No. 8 Clinton Place, New-York August 5th, 1847.
☞ School will be opened Wednesday, Sept. 1, 1847.
August 14—7t

THEOLOGY.

Albadie on the Divinity. 18mo. London. $1.
Abercrombie's Lectures on Church Catechism. 8vo. 75 cts.
Abernethy's Sermons. 4 vols, 8vo.
Adams's Exposition of the Four Gospels. 2 vols. 8vo. 5 00.
Do. Do. of St. Matthew. 8vo. 1 50.
Do. on St. Peter. Imp. 8vo. 6 50.
Do. on Romans. 7 50.
Do. Religious World Displayed. 3 vols. 4 00.
Do. Private Thought. 31 cts.
Do. A System of Divinity, &c. &c. 1 00.
Addington's Life of the Apostle St. Paul. calf, 8vo. 1 50.
Addison's Evidences, with additional Discourses. 1 25.
Alexander on Conons of Scripture.
Do. Evidences.
Do: Isaiah.
Allens—A Chain of Scripture Chronology from the Creation to the Death of Christ. 4to. 1 50.
Allestry Sermons, folio, 4 00.
Alliene Works. 1 00.
Allison's Sermons (various editions.)
Ambrose Looking unto Jesus, &c. 2 00.
Ambrosii Epesiojii. 1 75.
American Church, by Wilberforce. 1 50.
Anderson on Lord's Prayer.
For sale by
STANFORD & SWORDS, 139 Broadway.
A new Catalogue of Theological Works to be had gratis.
August 14.

NEW ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

Sermons by Henry Edward Manning, M. A. vol. 3, $3.
The Christian Obligations of Citizenship. A Discourse by the Rev. John S. Sheppard, M. A. 12 mo. $2.
The Year Book of Missions, containing an account of Missionary Societies, British, Continental and American, by Elijah Hoole, vol. 8, $2,50.
The Pulpit, Sermons by Eminent Living Divines, volume 51, $2.
Practical Sermons, by the Rev. Wm. Fitzgerald, B. A. 12 mo. $1,50.
The Unity of the Episcopate Considered, a reply to the Work of the Rev. S. W. Allies, entitled "The Church of England Cleared from the charge of Schism." 12 mo. 1,37
The Bible Cyclopædia, compiled from the best authorities, by the Rev. J. P. Lawson, M. A. volume 1, Biography, $3.
Rev. J. P. Lawson, Ma. vol. 1. Biography $3.
Practical Sermon by the Rev. G. W. Woodhouse. Ma. vol. 2. $1 75.
Imported and for sale by
1t D. APPLETON & CO., 200 Broadway.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES,
Near Harperstown, Maryland.

The next Session of this Institution will open on Monday, October 4th—at which time the students in Theology and in

The Grammar School

should punctually attend. All the usual classes in the Collegiate and the Preparatory Departments are fully organized. Application for further information, or for the admission of Students, to be made to
JOHN B. KERFOOT, Rector.
August 14—8t

EDUCATION.

A Young Man, who has for some time taught a select school, is desirous of obtaining a situation as tutor in a private family. In addition to the ordinary English branches, he will, if desired, give instructions in the Latin, Greek, and French languages.
Ample references will be given if wished.
Please communicate with the Rev. Benjamin Evans, Rector of the Church of the Holy Evangelists, New York city. August 7—4t

Wanted, a situation as Governess, in a respectable Episcopal family, by a young lady competent to teach the different branches of an English education, as well as the French language, and the Piano Forte. Apply at this office, where satisfactory references will be given. Aug. 7—4t.

CHURCH TRIMMINGS.

The subscribers keep constantly on hand an assortment of Pulpit Trimmings, consisting of Satin and Worsted Damasks, Silk Velvets, and Plusors, with an assortment of Silk Tassells, Fringes, Gimps, and every other article required for Pulpit Trimmings.
Also furnished to order Pew Cushions, either in Hair or Moss. Pews stuffed and lined.
CHARLES McAULEY & CO.,
Upholsterers, 116 Hudson street.
February 27—yly

CONSOLATIONS FOR THE LONELY.

BY MARY HOWITT.

There is a land where beauty cannot fade,
Nor sorrow dim the eye;
Where true love shall not droop, nor be dismayed,
And none shall ever die!
Where is that land—O where?
For I would hasten there;
Tell me—I fain would go,
For I am weary with a heavy woe!
The beautiful have left me all alone;
The true, tender, from my path have gone!
O guide me with thy hand,
If thou dost know that land,
For I am burdened with oppressive care,
And I am weak and fearful with despair—
Where is it? Tell me where.

Friend, thou must trust in Him who trod before,
The desolate paths of life;
Must bear in meekness, as He meekly bore,
Sorrow, and pain, and strife!
Think how the Son of God
These thorny paths hath trod;
Think how he longed to go,
Yet tarried out, for thee, the appointed woe;
Think of his weariness in places dim,
Where no man comforted or cared for Him!
Think of the blood-like sweat
With which his brow was wet;
Yet how he prayed, unaided and alone,
In that great agony, "Thy will be done!"
Friend, do not thou despair—
Christ, from His heaven of heavens, will hear thy prayer!

For the Churchman.

TRACTS FOR THE SEASONS.

NO. CXXXI.

"The faith of Christ crucified," is that to which Christians are devoted and pledged in Baptism; in token whereof the Church, when they receive that Holy Sacrament, signs them with the sign of The Cross. This doctrine embraces the principle of a vicarious sacrifice, an atonement for the sins of others, the penalty due to our iniquities paid by Him who knew no sin, but was made sin for us, and by the infinite merit of His obedience, sufferings, and death, satisfied that divine justice which would otherwise have overwhelmed us, called into exercise that mercy which will reward sincere though imperfect obedience, and procured grace to enable us to render sincere obedience.

This great doctrine has at its foundation, the truth of human depravity and guilt—clearly manifested by the history of man, by the personal observation of every one who takes a candid view of the world around him, and by the experience of all who look fairly into their own characters and lives, and truly know their own hearts. Reason finds it impossible to withhold her assent from this truth, and yet revolts at the idea that man was thus originally formed; while, at the same time, she is utterly at a loss to account for the introduction among us of such sore depravity, and to see how its degrading and destructive effects can be counteracted. The wisest men who have had her only for their guide have felt and acknowledged this, and owned their dependence for a satisfactory solution on a revelation from God. This has been vouchsafed, and is recorded in the Holy Bible.

Man's first estate was one of happiness and perfection. Unsinning obedience was the just and practicable condition of its continuance. This he wilfully violated. The cord which united him to his pristine perfection was thereby broken, and his nature, consequently, underwent a corrupting change, and fell into the deep abyss of degradation and sinfulness consequent on the casting off of divine influence, and surrendry to that of the great author of all the evil of both sin and suffering. The God, however, whom he had offended, of any claim to whose mercy he had wilfully deprived himself, and whose awful malediction he had incurred, was still a God of love: but the harmony of His attributes, the preservation of which is essential to His infinite perfection, would not suffer any one to be sacrificed to another. As, therefore, His truth and justice were pledged for the punishment of man's transgression, their demands must be met before the favor which man had forfeited can be restored to him. This was the object of the mediation of the Son of God, and His consequently becoming Man by taking the human into union with His divine nature. By virtue of His divinity, all that He should do and suffer would, of course, be not of obligation or necessity, but entirely voluntary; and would, therefore, have perfect merit attached to it. He engaged to perform obedience, and undergo suffering, as man's Representative—in mans' stead; and thus, for him, propitiate the divine displeasure, and purchase divine favor.

This unspeakably merciful and awfully mysterious mediation—a work entirely beyond the ability of any created being, for such would have obligations of his own to discharge which would utterly exclude vicarious merit—having been determined in the counsels of the Trinity, its benefits were immediately imparted. Guilty man was spared, and again placed in probation for heaven. Grace was provided and promised to enable him to pass that probation successfully. Pardon, on repentance, was to be granted for his violations of the divine law. Sincere endeavors on his part, though necessarily weak in themselves, and imperfect in their issue, were to be accepted in place of that unsinning obedience which was the condition of the first covenant. And finally, through the mediation of the Redeemer—the merits of which only could procure grace to do any thing, and the acceptance of any thing, as conditions of so great a mercy—he was to attain to that celestial happiness, of all hope of which his fall had deprived him.

At the time which seemed best to divine wisdom, the Son of God came into the world, and took the human nature, and living in favor with God, and in the full and blameless keeping of all His commandments and ordinances, rendered that perfect obedience which a mere man never could, and which only is meritorious in the sight of Heaven.

During the three years that He spent in the more immediate functions of His ministry, and particularly at their close, intense and aggravated sufferings were endured by Him as the penalty for man's transgressions which He came to pay. Then we see Him a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. We behold Him delivered into the hands of wicked men, who exerted against Him all the cruelty which ingenious malice could invent: God, in this awful dispensation, as often in the inflictions of His providence, using such men as His instruments of chastisement. His sufferings, too, were infinitely greater than human cruelty could occasion; for the power of darkness was using its hour of permission to inflict those infernal pangs which were a part of the execution of God's just wrath against the accumulated guilt of the world of sinners for whom Christ was mediating. Hence His sore amazement and great heaviness, His exceeding sorrow even unto death, and the sweat of blood which His awful agony occasioned. And there was still a greater depth in this unfathomable mystery. In those ways of God's justice which are past finding out, the Mediator must feel a pang yet greater than all the others. Those whom He represents had incurred banishment from the face of their offended Maker. This bitterest ingredient is now added to Christ's cup of trembling—*My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?* He obeyed and suffered unto death, even the most painful and ignominious death that could be inflicted, that of the cross. There bowing His head, and giving up the Ghost, He made His soul an offering for sin. Never, at other time, has language approached in awful mystery, infinite importance, and ineffable mercy, what was meant when, with His departing breath, Jesus cried, *It is finished*—the great work of man's redemption is complete. Mercy and truth there met together, righteousness and peace kissed each other. Divine love, in perfect harmony with divine justice, can now justify the sinner. The holiness of God and His law have been vindicated; and there is salvation for all who look to Christ crucified with the required faith.

Lamentably the reverse of this faith, however, is manifested in the reception with which the great doctrine herein involved too frequently meets among men. In one of the perpetually recurring instances in which St. Paul holds up this doctrine as the life and substance of the Gospel, he refers to its effect upon the two classes of men of whom the community was then composed—the Jews, and Greeks or Gentiles. "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."* These men have unfortunately their representatives and imitators, even among professing Christians of the present day.

The Jews, in the Apostle's time, were much moved with pride for the honor of having in their keeping what had then been indited of the Holy Scriptures, and were prone to interpret them with a very partial eye to their own interests and feelings. Arrogating to themselves exclusive pretensions to the favor and grace of God, they cherished the idea that the Messiah would be their temporal deliverer—a powerful earthly prince, heading an army of their people, rescuing them from Roman bondage, and exalting them to national independence and supremacy. When therefore they saw Jesus the child of poverty, and beheld Him, through life, walking in humility, making Himself of no reputation, and yet claiming to be the predicted Messiah; and when they saw Him such a Sufferer, and dying such a death; they were offended at Him. They forgot that their law was replete with types of the ministry of a suffering and sacrificed Messiah; that their prophecies clearly and constantly foretold such a One; that the kingdom, the victory, the glory, promised, were to be *spiritual*, beginning on earth and consummated in heaven; and that the subjects of these blessings were to be, although the members of the Church to which *they* belonged, yet of that Church under a holier and better dispensation, into which all mankind were to be called to join the ancient people of God. The blindness of the Jews to these things, and the inveteracy of their prejudices against them, made the blessed doctrine of Christ crucified a stumbling block to them.

Particularly was this effect produced by their selfish and contracted views of the designed extent of the Messiah's benefits. Nothing excited in them warmer feelings of disappointment, or more determined opposition to the labors of the apostles, than the intimations which our Saviour gave, and the full proof His ministers afterwards afforded, that the Gentiles were, with the Jews, to be admitted to the benefits of His religion. When, therefore, they heard the instructions, calls, and invitations of the Gospel given to the Gentiles, and saw them joining the ranks of Jesus as the Messiah, they saw what was indeed the fulfilment of clear and repeated prophecies of their own sacred books; but so perverted was their vision by their pride and selfishness, that they saw it not in this light. This enlargement of the sphere of the Messiah's blessed influences and ministry was offensive to them.

Nor did they like a doctrine which antitypically fulfilled their ceremonial law, an easy cover, as abused by them, and corrupted by their traditions, to their hypocrisy. They liked not the faith which required holy and self-denying affections and tempers, and a course of evangelical purity and holiness. Accustomed, in the pride and selfishness of the natural man, to trust to the merit of their works and the extraordinary virtue of peculiarly punctilious exactness in ceremonial observances, their hearts rebelled against the self-sacrifice required in looking beyond themselves, even to Christ crucified, for all the merit that they can plead before God, and the only ground of hope of acceptance with Him.

For these and other reasons, this doctrine gave offence to the Jews, and instead of answering its graciously designed end of elevating their spiritual character, and raising them in the favor of the God of their fathers, was turned by them into very means of falling into deeper error and more hopeless delusion.

And what but a stumbling block is the doctrine of Christ crucified to the Christian who makes it a subject of vain and unedifying speculation? It was never intended to be thoroughly understood by man. As a fact, it is clearly revealed, and is therefore to be undoubtingly received by him. Its intent, its benefits, and the means of securing them, are also revealed, and are therefore to be thoroughly believed, with a gratitude which warms the heart with love, and a sincerity which absorbs it in devotion. It is indeed a great mystery into which angels desire to look, and the requiring of assent to which constitutes a most wholesome discipline of mind in a truly legitimate department of intellectual and moral responsibility—receiving truth, on sufficient evidence that it is truth, even though its thorough investigation and full comprehension are beyond the powers of the human mind. Let it be thus received, in the simple love of truth. Then, while the metaphysical and ingenious speculations of others are perverting it into a stumbling-block, which hinders their spiritual advancement, and exposes them, as moral beings, to serious injury, it will reward the true Christian's confidence and trust by the heavenly comfort and encouragement which it ministers, the joys which it reveals, the clear and satisfactory light which it sheds on human duty, and the hope full of immortality which it inspires.

The unfavorable effect upon the religious principles and character of the Jews, growing out of their disposition to put unscriptural bounds to the intended sphere of the benefits of the Messiah's mediation, is shared, in no small degree, by Christians who take a similarly contracted view. No point is more fully and clearly revealed in the Bible than that the free gift of the grace of redemption was designed, in all the fulness of its blessings, to be co-extensive with the condemnation incurred by the fall, that is, to embrace all mankind. The contrary theory—that there is a portion of men eternally excluded by God's own decree from that grace—is anti-Christian; and connected with the notion of oneself being of the favored opposite class—the elected few whom another divine decree has chosen to an indefeasible interest in Christ's salvation—it is a great stumbling-block in the way of sound faith and genuine piety. Often too is it a hindrance placed by Satan to the moving appeals which the Gospel makes to negligent and hardened sinners; who readily see that if thus grace and salvation are dealt out by a divine sovereignty irrespective of human character, principles, and deeds, it matters not whether they hear, or whether they forbear: all is everlastingly determined for them.

Thus insinuates the adversary. The Gospel bids each one know and feel that *he* is one for whose spiritual and eternal good, whose pardon, sanctification, and salvation, Christ came into the world, suffered, and died; and therefore that to *him* the call is given to believe, repent, obey, and live forever; and his ultimate ruin, if encountered, must be of his own seeking.

Forgetfulness of each one's personal responsibility, in this matter, is entirely inconsistent with evangelical doctrine. Christ's mediation was for moral agents. He procured for us ability to work out our own salvation, and bids us do it; but there is no such necessary efficacy in His atonement as to secure that salvation without our laboring for it ourselves. The ability which He provides for us is offered to our acceptance and improvement, for which sufficient power is given, through Christ's redemption, unto every man that is born into the world. And although even the best services thus rendered will be necessarily imperfect and unworthy, yet will they, if rendered in true faith and sincerity, be, for Christ's sake, allowed to be available as the working out of our salvation.

As to the Jews a stumbling-block, so also was the doctrine of Christ crucified to the Greeks, or Gentiles, foolishness.

These men prided themselves on their learning and philosophy. And unhappily, and in evidence of that depravity which those who most exhibit are most apt to deny, the pursuit of human science, unchastened and uncontrolled by divine knowledge, and spiritual affection, has a strong tendency to lead the understanding astray, and oppose a serious barrier to the truly enlightened and valuable exercise of our intellectual powers. The human mind, unsanctified by true religion, is prone to abuse the increase of knowledge to subservience to intellectual pride, and to make the mere figments of a misguided or inflated fancy, objects of admiration, tests of truth, and rules of conduct. Such was the case with the Greeks in the apostle's time. They had not enough either of virtue, or of that sound judgment which religious principle only can secure, to avoid being unduly elated by their acquisitions in the learning and science of the day. They thought themselves philosophers; and too proud of this to be willing to be learners, even in religion, looked down with disdain on the teachings of the despised Nazarene and His disciples, and especially on the great truth of Christ crucified, which lay at the foundation of all their doctrine. The unwelcome principle which it involves of the depravity and corruption of human nature, suited not their finely spun theories of the dignity of man. The atonement and vicarious merit which it sets forth were unwelcome to the pride which would found a claim to Heaven's favor on the purity of their virtues and the merit of their works. The plan of redemption which it unfolds contravened their notions of the Deity, whom imagined reason taught them to regard as merging in an irrespective infinite benevolence, that truth and justice which are essential to perfection. The incarnation of Deity which it exhibits, because transcending the limited powers of human comprehension, was rejected and reviled. The humbling and self-denying principles which it inculcates, met with a repulse from their strong temptation to cover unholy and vicious dispositions and affections with the easy apology, or the positive approval, which their philosophy afforded. They therefore counted it foolishness.

But sounder heads and better hearts, even among the heathen, had formed widely different conclusions. The best philosophers of old felt and acknowledged the necessity of Divine interposition to raise man from his depravity and sinfulness, and commend him to the mercy of God. How this was to be effected they were unable to say; but knowing that relief could come from no other source, they looked with anxiety for the developments in this behalf, of God's good providence and grace. When these were vouchsafed, the prouder, but not more wise or learned philosophers of the day, spurned the offered blessing. Christ crusified was unto them foolishness.

There is a philosophy of the same stamp among us, unblushingly denouncing as foolishness, the religion of the cross. It has its foundation, if not in ignorance of human nature, at least in a total disregard for the just conclusions to which a true knowledge of it leads; dignifies with the name of reason the vauntings of intellectual pride, and the fictions of a disordered, or ill directed imagination; and is often but a shelter for vicious affections and dispositions. This philosophy presumes to pass judgment against a doctrine which is supported by irresistible evidence, is essential to worthy and consistent ideas of the Supreme Being, and has been cordially embraced by those whom true learning and science have enrolled among their most distinguished votaries. And so reckless and untiring is the proud ingenuity of man in corrupting and perverting the true and sincere Word of God, that the cause of this open and avowed infidelity finds a powerful auxiliary in the boldness with which, even under the assumption of the Christian name and character, Christ crusified, in its genuineness and integrity as a gospel doctrine, is treated as foolishness, and even mocked at, by fancied superior intelligence and illumination. All oppositions to the divinity and atonement of Jesus, and to the necessity of the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Divine Third Person in the Trinity, are oppositions to the doctrine of Christ crucified, with the integrity and just influence of which these points are essentially connected; and therefore to the gospel of which it is so fundamental and essential a part.

Many, too, who would shrink from the charge of denying this doctrine through heresy or infidelity, are yet guilty of treating it as foolishness. Inconsistent professers of it, they are lamentably neglectful of its solemn recognition in the services of the sanctuary and the altar, and in the due manifestation, in their lives and characters, of the pure faith, the holy hope, and the genuine charity, to which it urges. We see in them the proud resistance of the natural heart to the self-abasement, the renunciation of all claim to inherent ability to serve God, and to the merit of personal holiness and virtue, and the sole dependence on the merits of the cross, which this great doctrine requires. Awful, too, is the contempt cast on the proffered blessings of the gospel by the full ranks of professing Christians, who the service of that great adversary, whom to conquer cost the Redeemer His bitter pains, and His ignominious death. Out of the abundance of the heart the life derives its character and its course. And where are the hearts of a lamentable proportion of those who bear the christian name? Are they with Christ and Him crucified—filled with the love of Him, controlled by true faith in Him, animated and governed by holy devotion to Him? Alas! the world, the flesh, and the devil, to whose service they give themselves, ridicule the inquiry, and exhibit *foolishness* as the motto which they impress on the high and holy requisitions of faith in Christ crucified.

In contrast with this effect of the doctrine of Christ crucified on the Jews and Greeks, St. Paul proceeds to notice, that on its true and consistent professors—"but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

The terms called, elect, chosen, and such like, are applied in Scripture to christians at large—all who, professing the faith, are also united to the Church of Christ. Called, elected, chosen, by virtue of their admission into the Church, from the uncovenant-state of nature to the covenant-state of grace, their's becomes the exalted privilege of having the great and precious promises of the gospel made and pledged to them. These, however, because made to moral agents, are necessarily conditional. Unless men perform the conditions, they can neither claim, nor expect, the fulfilment of the promises; and consequently the privileges of the covenant, though thus promised, and made theirs, will, by their own rejection of them, be lost to them forever. While, however, their probation lasts, these privileges are theirs, if they will accept them, and may, by virtue of God's covenant in Jesus Christ, and on its conditions, be humbly claimed by them. Therefore, says the apostle, "Christ crucified," which, "unto the Jews and Greeks," in their uncovenant-state, was "a stumbling block and foolishness," is, "unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks"—unto them which, from either of these portions of men, turn to the profession of christianity, and become members of the Christian Church—if they refuse not to have it so, "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." This is their privilege, made their's by God's covenant in Christ. Unless they refuse to make the proper use of this gift, it will be effectual to their faith and holiness, and to their enjoyment of the good pleasure and tender mercies of God here, and His everlasting favor hereafter. Christ crucified will be to them indeed the power of God and the wisdom of God.

The course of Christian duty involves many difficulties and dangers, rendering indispensable the constant direction and aid of God's heavenly grace. A true, living, operative faith in Christ crucified is made the means and condition of our enjoying that grace. Thus the doctrine, duly received and improved, becomes the power of God. He who thus embraces it is led and strengthened by divine grace, and thus enabled to proceed in the required course of holiness and virtue. He has power given him to subdue the evil affections, propensities, and passions of his nature. His humble penitence, when lapses and imperfections prove that that nature still lusteth contrary to the Spirit, has promise of pardon, reconciliation, and renewed supplies of grace.—The view which his faith affords of his own nature and state, and of the divine perfections, manifests the wisdom of God in Christ crucified—that wisdom which, surpassing all that created intellect could compass, found a way whereby God could be just, and yet the Justifier of the sinner, and whereby all His attributes may unite in executing His righteous denunciations, and at the same time exercising His purposes of mercy and loving kindness. Animated and sustained by this faith in Christ crucified, the true Christian lives in the adoration of the wisdom, and in humble dependence on the power, which that blessed doctrine illustrates. Stedfast in faith, and joyful through hope, he diligently applies to the appointed means of increasing in divine wisdom, and growing in the power of the grace of God; until that power becomes effectual unto his salvation. Then, in the immediate presence and enjoyment of the Saviour in Whom, though not seen, he has believed, he will be brought to that happy and glorious consummation, where, knowing even as also he is known, he penetrates into the mysterious depths of that wisdom of God which here was past finding out.

B. T. O.

* 1 Corinthians i. 23.

DIOCESE OF LLANDAFF.

Confirmation.—Pastoral Letter of the Bishop.—Deanery, St. Paul's, June 9, 1847.—Reverend Brother,—With the full intention of holding confirmations throughout my Diocese this year, but being unable at present to fix the precise days, I think it best to call your serious attention to the subject, that you may not only prepare the young persons under your charge for the due reception of that ordinance of the Church, but that you may take this opportunity of instructing your congregation in its nature and true meaning, which is often ill understood by professed members of our Church, and still oftener misrepresented by those who separate themselves from our communion.

I do not wish to infuse the bitterness of religious controversy into these instructions; but we must not shrink from maintaining the original constitution of Christ's Church in every point which we believe to be essential, and which we know to have been sanctioned by the Apostles, and by those ministers whom they appointed to transmit its doctrines and its ordinances in unbroken succession to the present day.

That Christ did appoint a regular ministry, and that every member of His Church was to be admitted into it by baptism under their authority, is a truth as certain and undeniable as that He died on the cross and rose again on the third day. That the prayer for divine grace was accompanied by solemn imposition of hands upon those individuals who were specially commissioned to preach the word, and this rite was, in the apostolic age, adopted for the admission of believers into the privileges of the Church, cannot be questioned by any who receive the writings of the New Testament as the charter of our faith.

That this rite was universally practised, without distinction of race or sex, wherever the Gospel spread, is an undisputed fact—subject merely to variation as to circumstances of a subordinate kind, which do not affect its essential character. These variations, indeed, may be regarded as bearing testimony to the universal acceptance of the rite itself, as necessary to the due admission of every member into the Church. The difference of opinion as to the proper age of administering it has sprung up comparatively in modern times. In the ancient Church all we know concerning it is, that the practice of baptizing infants began very early, in accordance with our Saviour's affecting admonition and example, and that no dispute ever arose in any Church or country concerning the lawfulness of this practice, or its evil tendency, or its inconsistency with the Apostolical institutions. There is, then, a blank in the evidence of our opponents, which speaks more forcibly than the production of positive proofs on the other side. This silence shows that the thing was not only forbidden, but that it was never questioned; and when even the epistles in the New Testament, and every historical fragment of the three first centuries that has come down to us, bear testimony to prevalence of various heretical opinions and disorderly practices, which called for the correction of authority in those early times, how can we believe that this should have had universal acceptance, without the full and undoubted approval of the Apostles themselves, when perfectly enlightened as to the full extent of the Gospel dispensation?

That the baptized infant was gradually instructed in the doctrine of the Gospel, and when duly qualified was brought to the Bishop for the completion of his baptismal rite, is also an unqestionable truth. This public recognition of his spiritual incorporation with the Church was accompanied by solemn imposition of hands, and a prayer for the Divine blessing upon each individual.

That this rite should now be set at nought, and even derided (as I have known it to be by some Dissenters) is unaccountable in any professed Christians. I have heard them charge the doctrine with absurdity, that any man's salvation should depend upon such a ceremony. The same objection might be urged against every external ordinance. We do not teach that without this ordinance there can be no salvation; but we do teach and testify against all such gainsayers, that they put their salvation in peril when they offend any one of these little ones who believe in Christ; when, without any authority but that of each man's private conceit or fancy, they wilfully contravene the authority of all Christian Churches, and undermine the faith, and disturb the conscience, of a single brother for whom Christ died.

In maintaining the necessity of baptism as a means of regeneration, I would by all means advise you to avoid those subtle controversies respecting the precise meaning of regeneration, with which some have perplexed themselves, have erred concerning the faith, and have distracted the peace of the Church without any tendency to edification.

The Liturgy calls all the baptized *regenerate—i. e.*, in a state of grace: so St. Paul calls the Christian converts *sanctified—purified—temples of the Holy Ghost*—epithets applied even to those who incur his reproof. Baptism is the commencement of spiritual life—a life which grows with our growth. We cannot presume to say at what moment the saving influence of the Spirit fully operates, nor how far it may be resisted, or quenched, or covered within us. It is enough to know that without baptism we have no right to reckon upon it; nor even then, without the concurrence, as far as we are able, of our own prayers and endeavours to be in communion with the Spirit. Peremptory definitions of such points are presumptuous and dangerous, and have no tendency to improve the mind or to increase spiritual knowledge.

The same I would say of all metaphysical attempts to fix the exact boundaries of scriptural terms. Their meaning varies with the context, and can never be duly ascertained except in conjunction with it. And here I cannot but remind you of the golden rule in all reasoning—not to require greater accuracy in the definition of words than the nature of the argument in which you are engaged requires. All words are used with many variations of sense. If you suspect that the sense in which you employ them on any particular occasion is not perceived, explain it with precision and distinguish it carefully from all other of its senses; but never forget that this distinction is called for only to guard agaist mistake or confusion, not by any means to imply that this is its sole or its proper sense whenever it is used. In this manner you will avoid the unprofitable disputations which arise respecting such words as Grace, Regeneration, Faith, Election, and a multitude of others, which engender only strife, and lead to no useful purpose whatever, and yet will omit no saving truth or point of Christian doctrine.

In your instructions, therefore, upon the subject of confirmation my advice is that, having once placed the subject upon its true foundation, you should apply yourself to the explanation of such particulars as you find, by examination of each candidate, either misunderstood, or not so well understood as even a child is capable of; that you should point out the bearing it has upon their own individual case, according to their situation in life, or their domestic relations, or the temptations to which they are especially exposed; and, above all, that you should guard against the error which we are falsely accused of teaching, that as children of God they have now any privilege or blessing which they may not by their own sinfulnes any day forfeit. You will also doubtless impress upon them the grievous sin of speaking lightly on any Apostolic ordinance, especially of those in which the aid and the blessing of the Holy Ghost is devoutly implored.

The profane objection urged sometimes by Dissenters to the practice of imposition of hands, as if we believed there was some influence of a magical kind transmitted by this means from the commencement of the series to the present day, you may easily refute, even to a child's understanding. They might just as well call the blessing which accompanied the first imposition of hands by the Apostles a magical influence, as give that name to the act when performed in obedience to their authority and example.

I have addressed these thoughts to you, in the hope that you will communicate the substance of them in such manner as you may think best suited to the congregation you address, adding any simple illustrations that seem likely to render them more intelligible or more impressive. I earnestly wish you to speak not to children only, but to the old quite as much as to the young, and to furnish them with wholesome truths and scriptural reasons by which they may answer the gainsayers, and in so doing confirm themselves and the young people connected with them in the doctrines and Apostolic discipline of the primitive Church. I think also that this opportunity should not be omitted of inculcating the duty, so affectionately enjoined by our Lord and His Apostles, of union in the Church and of pointing out the great sin of causing schisms and divisions among Christians. I would ground these admonitions solely upon scriptural authority which is too plain to be mistaken. The sin of causeless separation is so repeatedly urged as an offence of the worst kind, that we should be inexcusable if we shrunk from declaring it, and from continually putting our flocks in rememberance of the danger they incur by wilfully disobeying these commands. And may the Almighty aid and prosper your labours, and give you strength and encouragement under all the vexatious opposition which I well know beset many of you in this branch of duty. Consider Him as looking on upon you when thus engaged, and remember His heavenly promise, that you shall be richly rewarded if you faint not.

I remain, your affectionate brother in Christ,

E. Llandaff.

Advertisements.

Churchman Book and Job Office.

W. H. B. SMITH,

(Successor to H. M. Onderdonk,)

BOOK AND FANCY JOB PRINTER,

No. 11 Spruce street, New York.

BOOK PRINTING, AND BINDING,

done with promptness, and in a style unsurpassed by any in the city of New York.

Checks, Drafts, Notes, Receipts, Bill-Heads, &c.

Executed with neatness and dispatch.

☞ W. H. B. S. having replenished his office with new materials, is prepared to do anything in his line which may be wished. Patronage is most respectfully solicited.

March 20—tf

FAMILY SCHOOL

THE Subscriber having two daughters of his own to educate, would be happy to receive into his family as Boarders, six or eight little girls, not exceeding twelve years of age, to be associated with them. Every attention will be paid to their moral and religious training according to the principles of the Church, and to their thorough instruction in the ordinary branches of an English Education, in Music, Drawing, French, &c., the elements of Botany, and such other branches of natural science as may be suited to their age and progress. The Young Ladies will be under the constant care and instruction of a competent Governess. The situation is about one mile from Newark, N. J. on the Bellville Road, and is reputed to be unusually healthy. The garden and play grounds are of a delightful description. The place may be reached from New York in forty minutes. For further information as to terms, &c., application may be made to Mr. Floyd Smith, No. 12 John street.

DAVID BROWN,
Presbyter of the Church.

June 5—tf.

CUTTER'S ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.

THIS WORK of 342 pages, by Calvin Cutter, M.D., has passed through seven editions of three thousand each in less than two years. It is used in most of the academies and select schools of New England and New York. It embraces—1st, Anatomy—a description of the Human System, illustrated by more than 200 engravings. 2d, Physiology—a description of the use of the several parts. 3d, Hygiene—rules for the preservation of health. 4th, Directions for the proper treatment of accidents—as the recovery of persons apparently drowned, arresting hemorrhage from divided blood vessels, &c.; making it a valuable work for families as well as schools. For sale by

CLARK & AUSTIN, 205 Broadway,
and the Booksellers generally.

July 31—4t

CHURCH CUSHIONS, PULPIT FURNITURE, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfully inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making Furniture for, and Trimmings of, Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
449 Broadway.

aug. 3—y

BOOKBINDING.

THE Subscriber respectfully informs the public tha he continues to carry on the above business in all its branches. All orders punctually attended to.

Reference is made to the following gentlemen—Messrs Stanford & Swords, at whose store orders may be left Rev. Drs. Seabury, Anthon, Taylor, Higbee, and Smith J. M. Wainwright, W. A. Muhlenberg, John S. Rogers, Esq., 194 Fulton.

September 5—yly WILLIAM ASHKETTLE.

CHURCH SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Miss Ayres, Principal.

No. 54 West Twentieth street, New York.

THE Fall Term of this Institution will commence on the 15th of September. A Prospectus of the School may be obtained of the Rev. W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., No. 110 Twentieth street; of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway; and at the Depository of the Sunday School Union, No. 20 John street.

References.

L. M. Hoffman, Esq., J. H. Swift, Esq., W. F. Cary, Esq., Govr. M. Wilkins, Esq., W. H. Aspinwall, Esq., R. B. Minturn, Esq., Murray Hoffman, Esq., Hamilton Wilkes, Esq.

July 17—tf

BOOK AND FANCY JOB PINRTING neatly executed at this office.

☞ *At reduced prices for Cash only* ☜

Published and for sale by

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository No. 20 John street, New York;

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION

Union Primer,	per hundred,	$2 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 25
" " " No. 2,	"	1 50
" " " No. 3,	"	1 75
" " " No. 4,	"	3 50
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	4 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 25
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 00
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	4 00
Beaven's Help to Catechizing,	"	6 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	2 50
Church Catechism,	"	1 00
First Truths,	"	2 00
Duty to God,	"	50
Church Primer,	"	1 25
Sunday School Liturgy, and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 50
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 00
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 00
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	1 50
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	20 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	6 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, Parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	8 00
Manual of Oral Instruction upon the Bible,	"	2 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child, with answers in the words of Scripture,	"	2 00
The History of our Blessed Lord, in Easy Verse,	"	6 00
Bible Companion, vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	18 00
" " vol. 2, New "	"	20 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff cov.,	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	6 00
Questions on the Acts, 1, "	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	5 00

NEW BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM SIMPLIFIED, *by Questions and Answers*, $3 00.

SCRIPTURE READING LESSONS *for Young children*, $6

☞ A discount of 10 per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools, auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

CHEAP LIBRARY. *One Hundred Volumes* bound, with muslin backs, and containing 158 books, put up by direction of the Executive Committee, for Ten Dollars This is believed to be the cheapest Library in th country.

THE LIBRARY to this date, in 167 vols., of various prices. Total, $24,44 nett.

THE CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 36 vols., of 144 pages each. Price for the set, $6,48 nett.

THE JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols., 32 mo. Price for the set, 87 cents nett.

BEAUTIFUL BOOKS FOR GIFTS.

In quarto form, upon superfine paper.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS. An Allegory By the Rev. Wm. Adams. With elegant illustrations. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cents; fancy paper covers, 25 cents.

THE DISTANT HILLS. An Allegory. By the same author. Similarly illustrated. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cts.

SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross, and The Distant Hills, in 1 vol. Muslin, gilt, $1.

THE DARK RIVER. An Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Munro. With 4 elegant illustrations. Muslin, 62 1-2 cents.

THE HISTORY OF OUR BLESSED LORD. In Easy Verse. With beautiful lithographic illustrations, &c. Muslin 50 cents; fancy paper covers, 31 cents.

THE CASTLE ON THE ROCK. With a fine wood engraving. Muslin, 25 cents, fancy paper covers, 12 1-2 cents.

FIDELIS, THE SOLDIER OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE. An Allegory. With a fine engraving. Fancy paper, 8 cents.

NEW LIBRARY BOOKS.

LUKE SHARP. A Tale of Modern Education,	half morocco,	34 cents
THE DARK RIVER,	"	30 "
THE FALL OF CRŒSUS	"	31 "
THE CRIPPLE OF THE RAILROAD,	"	15 "
THOMAS KENMIR.	"	12 "
GOTTFRIED, or THE ISLAND HERMITAGE,		23 "
THE CASTLE OF FALKENBOURG,	"	15 "
HISTORY OF CHARLES JONES,	"	10 "
PRASCA LOUPOULOFF, or Filial Piety Exemplified,		18 "
BAD HABITS,		10 "

PERIODICAL.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, *monthly publication*, 24 pages, 18mo—single, 25 cents per annum, and fifty copies for $10—payable always in advance.

☞ Address all orders for Books, and all remittances to DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John street.

may 16

THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

No. 56 Wall street.

Nett amount of accumulated premiums invested in mortgages and N. Y. State and City Stocks and U. S. Government, $376,282,20.

THIS Company is organized on the purely mutual principle, and its business is restricted by the charter to the insurance of lives, and granting annuities and endowments, and now ranks among the strongest and safest institutions in this country. The whole of the profits inure to the benefit of the policy holders. An extensive and prosperous business promises large dividends on the first division of profits on the 1st February, 1848, and persons now insuring will share in these profits if they survive that period.

The premiums are paid annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, if desired, and are as low as any American Company, and lower than the English, with a participation in the profits. Policy holders are secured by investments in bond and mortgages on real estate in the city of New York and Brooklyn, worth double the amount loaned thereon, and in stocks of the State and city of New York, and of the United States.

The transactions of this Company are on the cash principle; consequently the survivors of parties insuring with it will not be subjected to the heavy drawback of accumulated premium notes, reducing the benefit of the assurance to a small pittance.

Persons may effect insurance on their own lives and the lives of others. A married woman can insure the life of her husband, which will inure to her sole use and that of her children.

Pamphlets explanatory of the principles of Mutual Life Insurance, and illustrating its advantages, with forms of application, may be obtained at the office of the Company, 56 Wall street, or of any of its agents.

TRUSTEES.

Morris Robinson,	Alfred Pell,
William J. Hyslop,	David C. Colden,
R. H. McCurdy,	John C. Thatcher,
Frederick S. Winston,	Rufus L. Lord,
C. W. Faber,	William Betts,
Mortimer Livingston,	Joseph Blunt,
Theodore Sedgwick,	Isaac G. Pearson,
Stacy B. Collins.	William Barnewall,
John H. Swift,	William Moore,
Jos. B. Collins,	Zebedee Cook,
James S. Wadsworth	Jonathan Miller,
Henry W. Hubbell,	Fitz Green Halleck,
Gouverneur M. Wilkins,	Robert Schuyler,
John V. L. Pruyn,	Amos S. Perry,
Frederick Whittlesey,	Joseph Tuckerman,
Charles Ely,	Gidnon Hawley,
John C. Cruger,	Wm. J. Bunker,
Walter Joy,	One vacancy.

MORRIS ROBINSON, President.

SAMUEL HANNAY, Secretary.

MINTURN POST, M.D., Physician to the Com'y.

JOS. BLUNT, Solicitor. 504 Broadway.

May 22—tf

MR. YOUNG'S ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL INSTITUTE,

No. 1 Abingdon Square, corner of Bank st.

THIS School which has for nearly three years been located at No. 88 Fourth street, will be removed on the first of May, to the large and pleasant house, No. 1 Abingdon Square. The rooms will be fitted up and furnished with all the comforts of private parlors.

In addition to a thorough course of English and Classical instruction, the principal modern languages, drawing, vocal music, &c., are taught by competent instructors.

Terms—from $10 to $15 per quarter, without extra charges for any studies. Two or three pupils will be admitted into the Principal's family as boarding scholars, at a charge of $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

Circulars containing particulars, references, &c., may be had till 1st of May at 88 Fourth street.

March 27—tf

BOARDING and Day School for Young Ladies, at Wes Farms, Westchester county, New York.

The Spring Term will commence on the 12th of April, at which time Mrs. Wilkins will again be ready to receive a limited number of pupils as boarders. Those parents who may favor her with the care of their children may be assured that every attention will be paid to their happiness as well as to their education. The village of West Farms is healthy, and at the convenient distance of eleven miles from New York, from which place it is rendered easy of access by the Harlem Rail-road and stages from Morrisania.

For particulars apply personally, or by letter, addressed to Mr. Isaac Wilkins, West Farms.

Circulars may be obtained at the Churchman office, 12 John street. Feb. 27—tf